A Dialogue BETWEEN A Popish Priest AND AN English Protestant.

Wherein the Principal Points and Arguments of both RELIGIONS are truly Proposed, and fully Examined.

By *MATTHEW POOL*,
Author of the
SYNOPSIS CRITICORUM.

LONDON:
Printed for *Tho. Cockeril*, at the *Three Legs* in the *Poultrey*, over-against the *Stocks-Market*. 1685.

TO THE READER.

THE variety and differences of Religion between *Proteſtant* & *Papiſts*, diſtract the minds, and trouble the hearts of all that have any ſenſe of Religious Concernments. In this diſtraction, every ſerious man that hath any care of his ſoul, cannot chuſe but heartily deſire to ſeek for Reſolution. To obtain this, there can be no better way, than to underſtand and examine the Pretenſions and grounds of both Religions. In order to this, I have endeavoured faithfully to preſent, and duly to weigh them in the following Diſcourſe.

Wherein, though I have not diſcuſſed all the points in Controverſie be-

tween us and them: yet I have ſelected the moſt material, and have diſcourſed of moſt, if not all their weighty and plauſible arguments againſt the *Proteſtant Religion.* And this I may ſay, and no knowing *Papiſt* I think will deny it, all the other points will follow the fate of thoſe which are here examined, and live or die with them. I knovv it will be pretended, That I have managed the Work with partiality and deceit; and that I make the *Papiſt* ſpeak what I pleaſe, not what they think. This muſt be ſaid of courſe, elſe the *Romaniſts* loſe their old wont. Nor ſhall I at all think it ſtrange, if inſtead of ſolid anſwers, they return Calumnies: their cauſe requires it: and no wonder if they that want Truth in their Religion, make lyes their Refuge

To ſilence all clamours, and ſatisfie all jealouſies, will be impoſſible: I ſhall never attempt it.

But for ſatisfaction of ſuch as are rational and ingenuous, I ſhall give this following account.

1. God is my vvitneſs, that I did diligently endeavour to pick out the ſtrongeſt

ſtrongeſt arguments I could find in their beſt Authors in each Point: nor have I vvillingly declined any thing of moment in the queſtions here debated: if any *Papiſt* think othervviſe, let him produce their greater ſtrength, and I hope he ſhall find it fairly examined.

2. The ſeveral diſcourſes, arguments and anſvvers vvhich I put into the *Papiſts* mouth, are ſuch as vvere firſt taken out of their mouths: and ſo it is but a piece of Juſtice and Reſtitution, to return them thither. They are generally ſuch as are either knovvn to be their opinions, and by themſelves ovvned: or elſe delivered in the ſence, and very oft in the vvords of their moſt approved Authors, vvhom I have quoted in the Margent. But here I expect the old clamour of falſe quotations, vvherein they have been ſo often taken tardy, that they muſt novv look for the common infelicity of —— not to be believed if they ſhould chance to ſtumble upon Truth. All the relief I deſire in that caſe is, that the *Reader* who is able to do it would examine them with his ovvn eyes, and that vvill be my beſt juſtifica-

tion. I ſhall detain thee no longer, but commend thee to the good Spirit of Truth, to enable thee to diſcern betvveen good and evil.

TO

To the people of the *Romiſh* CHURCH.

THE *Controverſies between your Church, and ours, are by Gods bleſſing upon the endeavours of his Miniſters, brought to this paſs, That I am perſwaded there is nothing wanting to the conviction of divers of you, but a free and diligent peruſal of their books without prejudice and partiality. This your Prieſts knowing, it is their great deſign to keep you from looking into them; and to that end to poſſeſs you with this Principle,* That you need not trouble your ſelves to enquire into books, you are ſafe enough ſo long as you believe as the Church believes, and follow the guidance of your Prieſts and Fathers, *If this be an Error, it is a dagerous one, and may prove damnable: That it is ſo, and that it will prove but a broken reed when you lean upon it; I hope you will ſee there is reaſon to believe, if you will but do your ſouls that juſtice not prodigally to caſt them away upon blind and willful miſtakes, and take the pains to read theſe enſuing lines.*

1. *If your Church be not infallible, then this Principle is rotten; howſoever you can't with ſafety or diſcretion venture your ſou s on't, till you have examined at leaſt this one point of the Churches infal ibility, do but examine that, and if you do not*

ſlifle both Reaſon and conſcience, you will ſee it is a meer cheat.

2. *If the Church* (that is, *a Pope with a Council*) *were infallible* (*which is all that your great Champions plead for*) *yet all confeſs, that your particular Prieſts* (*upon whoſe conduct you hazard your Eternal welfare*) *are fallible, and ſubject to miſtakes. It's moſt certain, that divers of your Prieſts and Confeſſors lead you into many* (*and ſome of them*) *damnable Errors. Thouſands of your Prieſts, and learned Doctors, do charge the Jeſuits with poyſoning the Souls of the people with divers peſtilent and damnable Errors, ſuch as theſe*: That a man may venture his Soul upon any probable Opinion; and that is probable, which but one of their Learned Doctors affirm. That a private man may kill his enemy to maintain his honour, though not by way of revenge. That a Prieſt may Abſolve even old and inveterate ſinners, and ſuch as he believes incorrigible. That Affliction, or Sorrow for ſin, ariſing meerly from fear of puniſhments, is ſufficient for Salvation; and, that the Affection of Loving God, is not abſolutely neceſſary to Salvation. *All theſe and many more are clearly proved out of their own words and Writings in the Provincial Letters, otherwiſe called, The Myſtery of Jeſuitiſm: See the Latin Edition ſet forth and defended by* Wendrokius. *Now if the Jeſuits may, and do, ſo damnably deceive thoſe thouſands of you that depend upon their counſel and conduct, why may not other Orders deceive you in other things? Or what is there that can give you any reaſonable ſecurity? Is it their Learning, Prudence, pre-*

tended

tended Devotion, or honesty, or any other such like quality? why, divers of the Jesuits have given as plausible testimony of these things (so far as men can judge) as most of the other Orders; or will you say, all other Orders are infallible, the Jesuits only excepted?

3. *Nothing can be more evident (if the Bible be the word of God) than that the error or misguidance of the Priest, will not excuse the sin of the people. To satisfie you in this, I beseech you consider these few reasons.*

1. *The Scripture condemns, and God severely punished those people which did follow the errors of their Priests. This did not excuse the* Jews *in* Aarons *time, that they were misled by* Aaron, Exod. 32. *nor those in the times of the wicked Kings of* Israel *and* Judah, *that their Priests did universally deceive them; and poor* Elijah *and so* Michaiah, *were left alone; nor those in* Malachi's *days, that* the Priests *caused them to stumble at the law,* Mal. 2. 8. *nor the Crucifiers of Christ, that they obeyed the decrees of their Priests and Rulers.*

I list not to repeat what I have said elsewhere; therefore read Nullity of Romish Faith, Chap. 2. Sect. 12. *And will you yet stumble at the same stone?*

2. *The people will not be excused by their priests misguidance, because they neglect their duty. If indeed there were no duty incumbent upon the people but to believe what your Priests say, and do what they require, then your Church speaks reason. But that none but a mad man will say.*

There are several duties required of the people, no less than of the Priests; the Law of God was

not given only to the priests, but to all the people; God publisheth this law in the hearing of all the people, and speaks in the singular number to every one of the people; Thou shalt do or forbear *this or that; and the curse is threatned to the people,* Deut. 27 26. Cursed be he that confirmeth not all the words of this Law to do them: and all the people shall say, *Amen. which the Apostle repeats,* Gal. 3. 10. Cursed is every ONE, *not the Priests only, but the people too,* that continueth not in all things which are written in this Book of the Law to do them. *If the Priests* then *shou'd have taught the* Israelites, *(as your Priests* now *teach you),* Thou shalt worship a Graven Image, *when God saith,* Thou shalt not worship a Graven Image: *Can any serious man think this would have freed them from that curse; and that it was safer for them to obey the command of men, than of God? O the impudence of your Priests that dare say so? Oh the blockishness of those people that will believe them when they say so; your* Pope *may well contend with* us, *for it seems your* Priests *will contest with* God *for* Supremacy. *When the priests and Prophets in* Isaiahs *days were generally corrupted, the people are not advised to believe all that they taught, and to obey all that they decreed, (which is the strain of your Church), but are commanded immediately to go to the* Law, and to the Testimony; *and* if any speak not according to them, *they are to be rejected,* because there is no light in them, *Isa.* 8. 20. *Even people are required* not to believe every spirit, *but* to try the spirits, 1 John 4. 1. *Nor did the Apostles exempt themselves and their Doctrines*

diſſuades from this Tryal, *but allowed, commended, and required it in the people.*

The Beræans *are not reproved and cenſured (as they would certainly be that ſhould tread in their ſteps, at* Rome) *but commended for examining the Doctrine of St.* Paul *by the Scripture,* Acts 17. 11. *And the ſame Apoſtle allows the* Galatians, *not only to try his Doctrines, whether they were agreeable to what they had received; but in caſe they find them contrary, he gives them Commiſſion to cenſure and anathematize him,* Gal. 1. 8, 9. *And he ſpeaks the* Corinthians *in this Language,* I ſpeak to wiſe men, judg you what I ſay, 1 Cor 10 15. *And he commands the* Theſſalonians *to* prove all things (*without exception*) *as well as to* hold faſt that that is good, 1 *Theſſ.* 5. 21. *Conſider theſe things, I beſeech you, and do not wilfully caſt away your precious Souls upon trifles. God hath given the Scripture as a Rule to try things by (and this was written for the Ignorant, and the people, as well as the Learned, and the Prieſts;* John 20. 31.) *he hath given people reaſon to try things with; if you will hide theſe Talents in a Napkin, at your peril be it. The Prince was commanded to* read and meditate in the Book of the Law, that he might obſerve to do all that is written therein, *Joſh.* 1. 8. *Can you ſeriouſly think, that if the corrupt prieſts had agreed to teach him to do contrary to all that was written therein, that this would have excuſed him before God? then that precept was both ſuperſtitious and dangerous; and if you do not think ſo (as you muſt needs, if you have any Conſcience), then neither will it excuſe your people; for according to the Doctrine of your Church, Prince and*

people

People are alike in this, both tied to believe as your Church believes. God commands every Christian to prove his own work; *and tells us, that* every man shall bear his own burthen, *Gal.* 6. 4, 5. *& that* every man shall give an account of himself to God, *Rom.* 14. 12. *(Do not think your Priests account shall serve turn) and all the Christian people of* Corinth *are commanded to* examine themselves whether they be in the faith, 2 Cor. 13. 5. *and dare you still live in the wilful breach of all these commands, and blindly give up your souls and consciences by an implicit faith, to the conduct of your Priests, to lead them whither they please?*

3. *The Scripture hath given you full warning of your danger. Read but two places.* Eze. 33 8. *(where God assures us, that the* wicked shall dye in his iniquity, *tho he perished through the watchmans fault) and* Mat. 15.14 *(where Christ confutes this very opinion of yours, which was also the opinion of the* Jews, *that they were safe enough while they followed their Priests Decrees and Connsels and tells them,* If the blind lead the blind, both shall fall into the ditch) *and doubt of this if you can or dare.*

In a word; if this senseless Doctrine were true, not only Men would have Dominion over our faith, contrary to express Scripture; Be not ye called Masters, for one is your Master, even Christ, *Matth* 23. 10. Not that we have dominion over your Faith *(said the great Apostle) but also Christ should lose his dominion, and have no Authority in his Church, but as your Priests please; and it seems he shall not have this favour from you, to continue in his office,* quamdiu bene te gesserit,

rit, *but* quamdiu vobis placuerit; *and Chriſts power is apparently limited to your interpretation; but the power of your Church is abſolute and unlimited, and the people obliged to believe them,* quamcunque ſententiam tulerint, *whatſoever they ſhall decree, as* Gretſer *expreſſeth it. If this be not to make the word and Authority of God and Chriſt void, through our Tradition, I know not what is. I will trouble you no further: If you be capable of Counſel, take warning, and ſuffer not your ſelves to be led Headlong by the Nose to Hell, to ſerve a carnal intereſt of ſome among you; but quit your ſelves like men, and by the groſneſs of this deluſion, learn to ſuſpect the reſt; and with humble and honeſt hearts, Read what is here propoſed to you for your Souls good, and God give you light. Let my ſoul proſper no otherwiſe than I heartily wiſh the good and ſalvation of you all; but if you will ſtill perſiſt in your blindneſs, and add further obſtinacy to your Errors, I ſhall comfort my ſelf in this, That I have delivered my own ſoul; your blood be upon your own head; for there it will aſſuredly fall, and not upon the Prieſts only.*

A DIALOGUE betvveen a *Popiſh Prieſt*, and an *Engliſh Proteſtant.*

Pop. *DEAR FRIEND, I am glad to meet with you after ſo long a ſeparation; for I remember we were brought up at the ſame School, and I rejoyce in the opportunity of renewing our acquaintance. I deſire a little diſcourſe with you, to underſtand how it is with you in point of Religion.*

Prot. I am of the Proteſtant Reformed Religion

Pop. *I am heartily ſorry for it in regard of our old intimacy; but if you will give me leave I do not queſtion, but in a very little time to give you ſuch reaſons as will force you to leave, thoſe damnable errors, and return to your ancient Mother the Church of* Rome.

Prot. With a very good will ſhall I yield my ſelf to your inſtructions; I deſire nothing more than true information; I know I have a ſoul

to

to ſave, which is of infinite worth, and I am not fond of damnation; therefore if you give me better grounds than I have, you ſhall not find me obſtinate: but this I muſt tell you, You muſt not put me off with fancies and bare affirmations; but I ſhall expect ſolid proof of what you ſay from Scripture or Reaſon; and now ſpeak what you pleaſe.

Pop. *Firſt, my dear Friend, I muſt intreat you to conſider that which your own Miniſters teach you, to wit, That there is no Salvation to be had out of the true Catholic Church, which is the Church of* Rome.

Prot. That none is ſaved out of the true Catholic Church, I grant (for the Catholic Church includes all Believers in the world): but a man may be ſaved that is no member of the *Roman*, nor of any particular Church; for although you ingroſs to your ſelves the name of the Catholic Church, nothing is more clear, than that the Church of *Rome* is at beſt but a part of the Catholic Church, and that a very unſound one too, and there is a falſe Church (in which Salvation cannot ordinarily be had) as well as a true Church (out of which it cannot ordinarily be had); and I have heard more to prove yours to be this falſe Church, than I am able to anſwer, or you either, as I ſuppoſe; therefore this being only a general (and ſo an unconcluding) Argument, I deſire you to come cloſer to the point.

Pop. *Then I intreat you conſider the danger of your way, and the ſafety of ours; ſince all your Miniſters confeſs, That a Roman Catholick may be*

ſaved

ſaved in his Religion; but all our Church unanimouſly declare That you are damned if you live and die in your Religion.

Prot. You call us Schiſmaticks; but by this Argument you prove your ſelves to be ſo: For I have oft heard it, that in the very ſame manner thoſe infamous Schiſmaticks, the *Donatiſts*, argued againſt St. *Auſtin*, and the Catholic Church, That he confeſſed ſalvation was to be had in their Churches, which they affirmed was not to be had in the Catholic Church; and this very thing was by St. *Auſtin*, and the Church of that age condemned as their great Schiſmatical Principle. But let that paſs. To come to your Argument, Remember the condition I made with you, that you do not put me off with Fancies, and bare Affirmations, for I expect you ſhall make good every word you ſay. Now here I find you under a great miſtake; and though I have heard it moſt confidently delivered by divers of your Brethren, yet you muſt give me leave to believe my own eyes and ears: I read it in divers Books of our Learned Engliſh Divines, and I have heard it from divers very able Scholars and Miniſters, That Popery, in theſe times and places of light, is to thoſe that may ſee that light, and will not, not only dangerous, but damnable; nor do I pin my Faith upon their ſleeves, but they have given me not meer affirmations, as you do; but ſuch Arguments as I confeſs I cannot anſwer; yet if you can, I ſhall be ready to hearken to you.

Pop. *It is eaſie to ſay in general, That our Religion is dangerous or damnable; but I beſeech you*

ſhew

ſhew me wherein ; which are thoſe Doctrines and Practiſes of ours wherein the danger lies ?

Prot. I will inſtance in few of many particulars :

Firſt, That Idolatry is a damnable ſin, your own Authors grant ; and Scripture expreſly affirms, *Idolaters ſhall not inherit the Kingdom of God*, 1 Cor. 6. 9, 10. and Rev. 21. 8 and 22. 15. And that your Church is guilty of Idolatry, eſpecially in the worſhip of Images, and of the Hoſt, or Conſecrated Bread in the Sacrament, is the Doctrine of all Proteſtant Churches, and I ſhall prove it before you and I have done.

Secondly, That the Worſhippers of the *Babyloniſh* beaſt, Rev. 13. 14. are in a damnable condition, you all grant ; and it is affirmed by God himſelf, *Rev.* 14. 8, 9, 10, 11. And that *Rome* is that *Babylon*, the moſt and learned'ſt of your Doctors agree, only ſome of them pretend it is *Rome-Heathen*, as it was; and others, that it is *Rome-Jewiſh*, as it ſhall be in the end of the World; both which conceits are fully refuted by divers of our Authors.

Thirdly, That it is highly dangerous to truſt in Man, and to truſt in our own Righteouſneſs, ſufficiently appears from *Jer* 17. 5. *Curſed is he that truſteth in man*; and from that dreadful example of the *Jews*, who going *about to eſtabliſh their own righteouſneſs, did not ſubmit to* (and therefore loſt the benefit of) *the righteouſneſs of Faith*, Rom. 10. 3. and that you are guilty of this ſin, in truſting to Saints and to your own Merits, ſhall appear in the following Diſcourſe.

Fourthly,

Fourthly, It is dangerous to add to the word of God; and this your Church is not only deeply guilty of, in adding their Tradition (* *to be received with equal reverence to the holy Scriptures*) but obliges all its Members to justifie those additions, and thereby intitle them to the same plagues with themselves.

Fifthly, (to name no more) It is highly dangerous to *break any of Gods commands, and to teach men so, and to make the word of God of none effect by humane Tradition*; we know the woes Christ pronounceth against the *Pharisees* for these things. And this your Church is deeply guilty of, as in many other particulars, so most eminently in this, that you profess no Men are obliged to receive the Scriptures as the word of God, nor to believe any thing in it, but for the testimony of your Church *.

By this it appears, that you have no reason to boast of the safeness of your way. And as for your threats of Damnation to all that do not submit themselves to your Church and Pope, however they may terrifie silly people, yet take it from me, to prudent men it is rather an argument of the falseness of your Religion, For such will be apt to conclude, that your faith is not right, because your uncharitableness is so notorious and monstrous in condemning all the world besides your selves and that too upon such frivolous pretences. This argument therefore of yours hath little weight.

* *Concil. Trident.* * See my *Nullity of Romish Faith*, Cap 2. Sect 4.

Let

Let me hear what further you have to say againſt our Religion.

Pop. *Then conſider ſeriouſly of this that your Church confeſſes, that ſhe is fallible, and that you have no infallible Judg among you, whereby Controverſies may be ended; but our Church is infallible.*

Prot. I confeſs now you ſpeak home; make this good, That it is neceſſary the Church ſhould be infallible, and that yours is ſo, and I ſhall eaſe you of the trouble of further Arguments; but I muſt ask you two Queſtions; 1. What is the meaning of this Propoſition? and 2. How will you prove it? For the firſt; I ask you how you underſtand it? What is this Church which you tell me is Infallible? Are you agreed among your ſelves in that point? To tell me of an infallible Judg, and not to give me infallible aſſurance who this Judg is, is to deceive me with vain words, and will no more end controverſies, than to tell me there is an infallible Judg in Heaven: For where, I pray you, ſhall I find your Infallible Judg? Now I am in queſt of him, I intreat your counſel and direction. Tell me then, Is it the body of your Church, and multitude of Catholicks, that is your infallible Judg? Do you make your people the Judg of Controverſies?

Pop. No; *For we all agree the government of the Church is Monarchical.*

Prot. Are you then agreed, that the Pope alone is the infallible Judg? Speak the truth, and the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

Pop.

Pop. *I will deal truly with you we are not all agreed in that point; the* French *Catholicks generally deny it, and divers of our eminent Doctors and Writers, as* (Bellarmine *confeſſes* *) *and among the reſt a Pope,* Adrian *by name, denies it; and even they that ſeem to be better minded towards the Pope, acknowledg that* it is no hereſie to deny this; and that divers good Catholicks deny it, and that it is but a diſputable point *.

Prot. Is it then a General Council that is infallible? Are you agreed in that? deal truly and clearly with me.

Pop *Then I muſt confeſs we are not all agreed in that neither; For the Pope will deny this, and all the* Jeſuits, *and* Italian *Catholicks, and others who aſcribe this Infallibility to the Pope only.*

Prot. Who then is this infallible Judg?

Pop. *The Pope, and a General Council agreeing together.*

Prot Is there then at this time any General Council at *Rome*, or elſewhere, which doth agree with the Pope?

Pop. *No; but though there be no Council now in their perſons, yet there is in their Writings, and the Pope agreeing with them, is Infallible.*

Prot. But I have been told, that all your Doctors agree in this, That no Writing can be a Judg of Controverſies: If you deny this, I ſhould think the Writing of God (which you all acknowledg the Scripture to be) might challenge this priviledg, as well as the Wri-

* *De Pontifice, l.* 4. *c.* 2.

* *Creſſy in Exomolog.* In the Appendix ch. 4. num. 7. *Holden de Reſolutione fide, l.* 2. *c.* 1.

tings

tings of any Council of men. You all plead for the absolute necessity of a living infallible Judg.

Pop. *Tho Catholicks are divided in the manner of expression, yet all are agreed in this general Proposition, That our Church is Infallible.*

Prot. Call you this only a difference in manner of expression, for one to say the Pope is infallible, another to say he is fallible? For some of you to affirm the infallibility of Councils, others utterly to deny it? I beseech you remember, I am inquiring after Particulars, (and therefore do not put me off with deceitful generals) who, and where is the man, or men to whom I must go to be infallibly resolved in all Controversies? For if the King should tell his people he hath appointed a Judg to end all their civil Controversies, this would be to no purpose, unless he should tell who that Judg is. So that till I hear you are agreed in this particular, my doubts and perplexities must needs remain. And then for the next point, I ask you, how you prove this Infallibility which you pretend to? I must tell you, since it is the very foundation of your faith I expect very clear and undeniable Proofs. I pray you bring me two or three of your strongest Arguments.

Pop. *In this you speak reason, and I shall comply with your desires. I shall give you two or three plain and evident Scriptures to prove it.* 1 *That of* Mat. 16. 18. *Hence I thus argue. The Church is said to be built upon St.* Peter *he is the Rock spoken of; and this Rock doth together with St.* Peter, *include his Successors; and the Church built*

upon

upon this Rock (that is, united to, and built upon the Pope) is infallible, for it is ſaid, The Gates of Hell ſhall not prevail againſt it.

Prot. Not one of theſe things is true.

1. It is more probable that not *Peter*'s Perſon, but his Doctrine or his Confeſſion concerning Chriſt, (which now he made) is the Rock upon which the Church is built; Scripture is its own beſt Interpreter; It is not *Peter*, but Chriſt which is the foundation of the Church, as he is called *Iſa.* 28. 16. compared with 1 *Pet.* 2 6, 7, 8. It is expreſly ſaid, 1 *Cor.* 3. 11. *Other foundation can no man lay but that that is laid, which is Jeſus Chriſt*; and this is the more conſiderable, becauſe he ſpeaks againſt thoſe that made the Apoſtles foundations, one ſaying, *I am of Paul*; *another, I of Apollos, I of Cæphas.* And if this were ſpoken of *Peter*, no more is ſaid of him here, than is ſaid of all the Prophets and Apoſtles, Epheſ. 2. 20. *Ye are built upon the foundation of the Apoſtles and Prophets.*—— And beſides, if by this Text *Peter* had been made Supreme and Infallible Head of the Church, and Judg of all Controverſies, no man in his wits can believe that St. *Paul* would have treated him ſo irreverently (to ſpeak the leaſt) as he doth *Gal.* 2 (which is more conſiderable, becauſe then Chriſt was dead, and *Peter* in the actual exerciſe of his Headſhip and Government, and if we may believe you, publickly and univerſally owned for ſuch) that he would have equalled himſelf with him as he doth *Verſe* 7. *The Goſpel of the Uncircumciſion was committed to me, as the Goſpel of the Circumciſion to Peter.* And that he would

would have ſpoken promiſcuouſly of *James*, *Cæphas* and *John*, that they *all ſeemed to be Pillars*, Verſ. 9. and not a word of *Peters* being the rock and foundation; and that he would have *withſtood St. Peter to his face*, as he did, *Verſe* 11.

2. If this were meant of *Peter*, yet this is nothing to his Succeſſors. You muſt firſt prove that St. *Peter* had a Succeſſor in that ſuppoſed univerſal Headſhip, which will be very hard to perſuade any underſtanding Man; for, 1. That authority which the Apoſtles had over all Churches, was peculiar to them, and died with them: we ſee God did not think it neceſſary to leave a Succeſſor to *Moſes*, (in his full and abſolute Authority) no more was it neceſſary to leave any after *Peter* and the Apoſtles; and the reaſon is the ſame, becauſe the work of the Law-giving was finiſh'd, and thoſe that came after were tyed to the execution of their Law. 2 Beſides, if *Peter* did leave a Succeſſor, what prudent man can believe that he would not have left ſome notice thereof to the world in one of his Epiſtles? I find he ſaith, *I will endeavour that you may be able after my deceaſe, to have theſe things in remembrance*, 2 Pet. 1.15. How eaſie had it been to have added, *to that end I leave a Succeſſor, whom you muſt hear in all things?* I find *Moſes* was very careful to leave a Succeſſor, and ſo was *Elias* and *David*, and Chriſt (*as my Father ſent me, ſo ſend I you*). Was *Peter* the only careleſs perſon, that would not be at the expence of a word to prevent all thoſe Hereſies, Schiſms, and Contentions which were even

then

then broached, and moſt likely to encreaſe after the death of the Apoſtles in the Chriſtian world?

3 If any did ſucceed St. *Peter* in his Headſhip, one would think it ſhould have been one of the ſurviving Apoſtles, eſpecially St. *John* who lived above twenty years after him; for who can believe (that regards what he believes) that *Linus* or *Clemens* who is ſaid to be St *Peter*'s Succeſſor, ſhould be ſuperiour to St. *John*? yet the foundation of all your Religion is built upon this nonſenſical opinion. And if this privileg did belong not only to *Peter*, but ſome of his Succeſſors; yet to ſay it belongs to all following Popes (divers of which are acknowledged to be apoſtatical and moſt wicked wretches); and that ſuch Monſters as were the true ſlaves of the Devil, and brands of Hell, ſhould be the foundations of the Church, by whom the Church was to be ſecured from the gates of Hell, will not find belief with ſerious Men, till Eaſt and Weſt meet together: and beſides, when our Divines ſay, The Pope is Antichriſt, and the Man of Sin; you uſe to anſwer, that theſe expreſſions, *the Antichriſt*, and *the man of ſin*, muſt needs point at a particular Man, and not a whole Order of Men; which if it be true, the expreſſion there uſed of this *Rock* (eſpecially being ſo particularly levell'd at *Peter*, as you will needs have it) cannot with any colour be thought too mean a Succeſſion of many hundreds of perſons. And ſure I am, whatever the Text ſpeaks of *Peter*, it ſpeaks not one word of *Peters* Succeſſors, and therefore it

is as eaſie for me to deny it, as you to affirm it.

4. Whatever this promiſe or priviledg is, it belongs no more to the Church of *Rome*, than to the Church of *England*, the name of one is here as clear as the other: It is a general promiſe extending to the Church at all times and places; ſignifying, that God will have and maintain a Church to the end of the World: And if this place concerns only thoſe that are built upon St. *Peter*, you grant the Church of *England* once was, as the Church of *Rome* now is, built upon him too, when it was ſubject to the Pope: And if their being built upon St. *Peter* did not ſecure them from Fallibility and Apoſtacy (as you ſay it did not), then conſequently the building of the Church of *Rome* upon St. *Peter*, did not make them infallible, but they might (as we ſay and prove they did) fall away. And certainly one of theſe two things muſt be granted, either that every Church which did once adhere to *Peter*, or the Pope, are ſecured by this Text from falling away; or elſe, that notwithſtanding this promiſe, every Church that now is ſubject to the Pope, may fall away from him, and ſo the Pope may be a Head without a Body, a Shepherd without ſo much as one Sheep: For if this Text did prove what they deſire, that all that do adhere to the Pope, whilſt they do ſo, are infallible; yet it doth not prove, that they all ſhall conſtantly adhere to him (which is quite another thing).

5. If this promiſe and priviledg did belong to any particular Church, and to yours (in a ſpecial

ſpecial manner), yet it doth not prove your Infallibility; this place concerns Doctrines no more than Manners, and ſecures your Church no more againſt damnable Hereſies, than againſt damnable Practices, ſince the gates of Hell prevail by one as well as by the other; and ſince you acknowledg that *Peter's* Succeſſors have lived and died in damnable ſins, they might as well die in damnable Hereſies: Beſides, if this Text did prove the Popes Supremacy, yet here is not one word concerning his Infallibility, which is quite another thing.

6. If this Text did prove any Infallibility, it doth not prove the Popes Infallibility (which you alledg this Text for) but the Infallibility of the Church which is built upon it.

Pop. *But that Church is Infallible, becauſe they adhere to the Rock*, viz. *the Pope, who therefore muſt needs be more Infallible.*

Prot. Then it ſeems the foundation of all your Infallibility is in the Pope, as *Peter's* Succeſſor, whom multitudes of your own Learned and approved Doctors acknowledg to be Fallible. I have heard you all confeſs, That your Popes may err in Manners and Practice. Is it ſo?

Pop. *Yes.*

Prot. Then whatſoever he thinks, he may ſpeak lies, and deceive the World, in telling them he is Infallible; and ſure if a Man will deceive for any thing, he will do it for ſuch an Empire as the Pope holds; but I have heard alſo your Popes may err in matters of fact.

Pop. *That we all agree in.*

Prot. Then he may mistake and err in these Questions, whether *Peter* left a Successor? and, whether the Bishop of *Rome* be the person? and, whether there hath been that uninterrupted succession in the Papal Chair, which you pretend to be necessary, which must be Infallibly certain, or else the Pope holds his Authority only upon Courtesie: so this place will not stand you in much stead. Let me hear if you have any better Argument.

Pop. *There is another place, which if you were not an obstinate sort of Men, would satisfie you all, and that is,* 1 Tim 3 15. *where the Church is called,* The pillar and ground of Truth, and *therefore is Infallible.*

Prot. Let me first ask you, What Church is there spoken of, which you say is Infallible? Is it the Church of *Rome*? Was *Timothy* Bishop of *Rome*, or no?

Pop. *No, he was Bishop of* Ephesus? *But why do you ask that question.*

Prot. This place apparently speaks of that Church in and over which *Timothy* was set; so if it speak of any particular Church, it must be that of *Ephesus* (which you confess was Fallible) not that of *Rome*; or if it speak of the Universal Church, that might be infallible though the Pope and all the Church of *Rome* (truly so called) should fail and perish. Tell me, I beseech you, in particular, what is that Church, which from this and other places, you conclude to be Infallible?

Pop. *It is the Pope with the General Council, as I have told you.*

Prot. Then I pray you make sense of the [illegible]se; for to me it is meer nonsense. *Timothy*

is here adviſed to *behave himſelf rightly in the Houſe of God, which is the Church of God, and the pillar and ground of Truth.* According to your opinion this is the ſenſe of it, *That thou mightſt know how to behave thy ſelf in the Pope and a General Council.* I pray you tell me truly, was there a General Council then ſitting?

Pop. *No, there was no General Council from that time, till two or three hundred years after, when the Council of Nice was aſſembled.*

Prot. Then it ſeems to me a moſt unreaſonable thing to ſay, that *Paul* directs *Timothy* how to behave himſelf in a General Council (which was not then in being, nor like to be) and that he doth not direct him how to behave himſelf in that body, the Church, in which he then reſided and ruled

Beſides, I pray you, Where is the Pope or a Council called the Houſe of God? If they have any thing to do there, they are the Governors, the Stewards, the Officers of the Houſe, but are never called the Houſe of God; but this Name is always aſcribed to the multitude of believers and profeſſors, as *Heb* 2. 5, 6. where *Moſes* (whoſe place in the Church the Pope pretends to) is not the Houſe, but the *Servant, the Officer of it*; ſo *Heb* 10. 21. *Having an High-Prieſt over the Houſe of God.* So 1 *Pet* 2 5 *Ye as lively ſtones are built up as a Spiritual Houſe*; And if you know any one place where it is otherwiſe uſed, I pray ſpeak; if not (as by your ſilence I ſee you do not) all underſtanding men will conclude, that neither Pope nor Council are concerned in this priviledg. But beſides, let me further ask you,

Can you give me aſſurance that theſe words, which *is the ground and pillar of Truth*, imply Infallibility?

Pop. *It is true, the words are figurative and metaphorical; but that is the meaning of them.*

Prot. My old Friend, can you adviſe me to venture my Salvation upon a metaphor? or that that is the true and only ſenſe of the words? Prove it, and I am your priſoner; but it ſeemeth to me far othewiſe. God ſaith to *Jeremy, I have made thee an Iron Pillar*, Jer. 1. 18. Was *Jeremy* therefore Infallible; paradventure, that was too mean a metal to amount to Infallibility; but your Church is a brazen Pillar, and ſo it ſeems by the impudence of your Aſſertions. I read in *Euſebius*, * That the Saints of *Vienna* and *Lyons*, called *Attalus* the Martyr, *A pi lar and ground of the Truth*; yet you will not allow him to be Infallible; by which and divers other paſſages it is ſufficiently evident, that a Pillar in the Church is no more than a man that is well rooted and grounded, and ſtrong in the faith, as he is a reed that is toſſed to and fro with every wind of Doctrine; let me therefore hear if you have any better arguments.

Pop. *Then* Joh. 16 3. *is an expreſs promiſe*, When the Spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all truth; and *therefore our Church is Infallible.*

Prot. Tell me, I pray you, is not this promiſe made to the Apoſtles only? If ſo, what

---

* *Lib.* 5 *Chap* 1

is that to you? If you ſay otherwiſe, how do you make it appear that it concerns their Succeſſors?

Pop. *That appears by comparing another place with it*, Joh. 14. 16 The Comforter ſhall abide with you for ever: *not ſurely in their perſons, for they were to die in a little time; but in their ſucceſſors.*

Prot. I expected a place which had ſaid at the leaſt, that the Spirit ſhould lead them into all truth for ever; but this is quite another thing; you dare not ſay, that every one with whom the comforter abides, is infallible; but to forgive you this great miſtake, tell me truly, Is it then your opinion, that all the Succeſſors of each of the Apoſtles, *viz.* all Biſhops, or all Miniſters, are infallible?

Pop *No, in no wiſe: for it is only St.* Peters *Succeſſors, or the Pope, who is infallible; and others only ſo far as they depend upon him, and cleave to him.*

Prot. Then this Text is not for your turn; for if it do extend to the Apoſtles Succeſſors, it extends either to all, or none; for ſure I am, this Text makes no difference: beſides, how do you prove that theſe words of the Spirits leading into all truth, if they do reach further than the Apoſtles, do imply infallibility? then all believers are Infallible, for they are all led by the Spirit, *Rom.* 8. 4.

Pop. *True, but here they are ſaid to be led into all truth.*

Prot. You know the words *all* and *every* are often taken in a limited ſenſe, as when the Goſpel is to be preached to every creature,

Mark 16. 15. And you may as well conclude the omniſciency of all believers, from 1 *Joh.* 2 20. *you know all things*; and *v.* 27. *the anointing teacheth you all things*: as the infallibility of your Popes or Councils from that phraſe: and one anſwer ſerves for both places, *viz.* that they ſpeak of all neceſſary truths. But why do I hear nothing of *Luke* 22. 31. *Simon, Simon, Satan hath deſired to winnow you, But I have prayed that thy faith fail not*? I have heard that *Bellarmine* uſeth this argument, but I confeſs, I thought they abuſed him.

Pop. *It is true, he doth uſe it, and it is a ſolid one, though you ſcorn it.*

Prot. How do you know that it is meant of all *Peter*'s Succeſſors? for there is not one word of them here. But if I grant theſe were meant, Do you then all believe that all *Peter*'s Succeſſors are Infallible?

Pop. *I did before acknowledg that we are divided in that point.*

Prot. Can you think to convince me with that argument that does not ſatisfie your own Brethren? Moreover, tell me I pray you, What was the faith of *Peter* which was ſtruck at by the Devil, and pray'd for by Chriſt?

Pop. *The event ſhews that; for the Devil tempted him, and prevailed with him to deny his Maſter.*

Prot. Did *Peter* deny Chriſt doctrinally, and fall into the damnable error of disbelieving Chriſt to be the Meſſias? or was it only an error of miſcarriage of his tongue, which ſpoke againſt his Conſcience and judgment?

Pop.

Pop. *Far be it from me, to say that* Peter *did so damnably err in his judgment, I know no Catholick who saith so; all do agree that it was only an error of his tongue and conversation, and a practical denyal of Christ.*

Prot. Very well; Hence then I gather that Christ pray'd for his practical, not for his doctrinal faith; and that his grace of faith might not be utterly lost by his fall; so that, if this Text and prayer reach to your Popes, it should rather secure them from damnable Apostacies in practice (which you confess many of them fell into, and died in) than from heresies (of which this Text speaks not at all). But have you no other Arguments?

Pop. *Yes, there is one more, which were sufficient if there were no other, and that is from Gods Providence: It is unbecoming the Wisdom of God to leave his Church without a guide, or Infallible Judg, by which means there would be no end of Controversies; and since you do not pretend to have any such in your Church, it must be in ours, or else there is none in the World.*

Prot. I had thought you would have only taught me, but now it seems you will teach God how to govern the world. It should seem to me, that God was not of your mind; he did not think fit to end all controversies, but to permit that there *should be Heresies*, 1 Cor. 11. 19. And if God in his wisdom thought an Infallible Judg necessary, certainly that same Wisdom would have named the place, person, or persons, where people should have found this infallibility. Was it ever known since the beginning of the World, that any Prince

conſtituted Judges in his Kingdom, not ſo much as giving notice to his people who they were, to whom they muſt reſort for Juſtice? this God hath not done; for you do not pretend a particular place which ſettles this infallible Judg at *Rome*, but only ſome general and fallacious Arguments, as I have proved; and beſides, it is ſo far from being evident, that your ſelves are not agreed about it: but ſome ſeek for this infallible Judgment in the Pope, others in a General Council; and theſe do as fiercely diſpute one againſt another in this point, as you do againſt us in many others: and therefore it is much more rational for me to conclude thus; God hath not nominated and appointed ſuch an infallible Judg in the Church; therefore there is none, and it is not fit there ſhould be one; than ſawcily to undertake to be the Counſellor of the Almighty, and to tell him what is fit to be done, and then conclude that it is done. In ſhort, For Controverſies about Fundamental and neceſſary things, God hath provided ſufficient means for the ending of them, having clearly enough determined them in his word for the ſatisfaction of all that are diligent, and humble, and teachable; And for Controverſies of leſſer moment, there is no neceſſi . having them ended; nor would they be much prejudicial to the peace of the World and the Church, if men would learn to give any allowance for the infirmities of humane nature, and exerciſe that great and neceſſary duty of Charity and mutual forbearance. But ſince this is all you can ſay, upon this particular, I pray you let me hear

hear what other Arguments you have againſt our Church and Doctrine.

Pop. Then another Argument againſt your Church and way, is taken from the Novelty of it; As for our Religion, it hath had poſſeſſion in the world ever ſince the Apoſtles days; but you are of Yeſterday, and know nothing; your Religion is an upſtart Religion, never heard of in the world till Luther's *days.*

Prot. Firſt let me ask you this queſtion, If you had lived in the days of Chriſt, or of the Apoſtles, or of the Primitive Fathers what would you have anſwered for your ſelf? you know better than I, that this was the very argument which *Jews* and *Heathens* urged againſt the *Chriſtians* then; they charged Chriſt with not *walking after the Tradition of the Elders*, Matth. 7. 5. And the *Athenians* ſaid to *Paul*, *May we know what this new Doctrine is?* Acts 17. 19. and the *Phariſees* had Antiquity on their ſide, being *Zealous for the Tradition of the Fathers*, Gal. 1. 14. And tho it be true that the Apoſtles had the firſt Antiquity for them, delivering nothing but what for ſubſtance *was in Moſes and the Prophets*, Acts 26. 22 (which alſo is our caſe) yet the *immediate and latter Antiquity* was againſt them, and for divers ages together theſe Doctrines had been in great meaſure obſcured and unknown. What then would you have anſwered to a *Jew* or a *Heathen* objecting this Novelty to you? Learn from Chriſt, Who when the *Jews* pleaded for the continuance of their old practices in the matter of Divorces he accounted it ſufficient confutation, that *from the beginning it was not*

ſo

ſo, Mat. 19. 7. And to all the pretences of the *Phariſees* from antiquity, he oppoſeth this one thing, *Search the Scriptures*, Joh. 5. 39. ſo you diſpute againſt us with the arguments which the *Phariſees* uſed againſt Chriſt, and we anſwer you as He anſwered them; Beſides, let me ask you this queſtion, If I could clearly prove to you all the points of our Faith, and diſprove the points of yours, from the Holy Scriptures, tell me, Would you then acknowledg the truth of the Proteſtant Religion, notwithſtanding all this pretended Novelty?

Pop. *Yes certainly, for we all confeſs the truth of all that is contained in the Holy Scriptures.*

Prot. Hence then it follows undeniably, that the main thing that you and I muſt look to in our faith is, that it be agreeable to the Holy Scriptures; and if ours be ſo (as I am fully perſwaded it is) and yours the contrary, neither antiquity is any argument for you, nor Novelty againſt us. Beſides, when you charge our Church with Novelty, I ſuppoſe you mean that our Doctrines are new.

Pop. *I do ſo.*

Prot. Then you cannot juſtly charge us with Novelty: For,

1. You confeſs the Antiquity and verity of the moſt of our Fundamental Doctrines, and your ſelves do approve them, only you make additions of your own to them? you own all the Scriptures in our Bible, only you and the *Apocripha*? you acknowledge Scripture the rule of Faith, only you add Tradition? we believe all the Articles of the Apoſtles Creed, (the

* belief

*belief whereof the Ancient Fathers thought ſufficient to Salvation), and the Doctrine of the four firſt General Councils as you do alſo; You own our Doctrine of Chriſt's ſatisfaction, and Juſtification by Chriſt and Faith, only you add your own works and ſatisfaction; our two Sacraments you approve, only you add five more; our Doctrine of the two ſtates of Men in Heaven and Hell you own, only you add Purgatory; You own Chriſt for your Mediator, and Prayers to God through him, only you add other Mediators; our worſhip of God you own, only you add Images. Theſe are the principal points of our Religion, and dare you now ſay that our Doctrines are new?

2 Many of your ableſt Doctors confeſs, that divers of the peculiar Doctrines of your Church are new and unknown to the Ancient Fathers; and it is moſt evident and undeniable concerning Indulgences, Purgatory, Communion in one kind, Worſhip in a ſtrange tongue, the receiving ſome of your Apocryphal Books, Tranſubſtantiation (eſpecially as an Article of Faith) the Popes infallibility, Worſhip of Images, denying of the reading of the Scriptures to the people, and others. And will you yet brag of the Antiquity of your Religion?

3. Theſe Doctrines wherein we differ from you, have been not only proved from Scripture, but from the plain teſtimony of Ancient Fathers, as I think none can doubt, that, laying aſide prejudices, ſhall read what our *Jewel*

*See *Potter* and *Chillingworth*.

and

and *Morton*, and *Field*, and others have written; How then can you have the confidence to Charge us with Novelty?

Pop. *Your Church is new in this reſpect, that altho ſome others before you might own ſome of your Doctrines, there was no Church that owned all your Doctrines both poſitive and negative.*

Prot. That is not neceſſary. I hope every alteration of Doctrines of leſs moment, doth not make the Church new; if it doth, it is moſt certain, that your Church is new alſo; for nothing can be more plain, than that the Catholic Church, nay, even your own Church at *Rome*, did not anciently, in former ages, hold all theſe Doctrines which now ſhe owns (as your own greateſt Authors confeſs); this is ſufficient, that the Church of God in moſt former ages hath owned all our Subſtantial Doctrines. But what have you further to ſay?

Pop. *It is ſufficient againſt you, that your Church is Schiſmatical, and you are all guilty of Schiſm, in departing from the true Catholic Church, which is but one, and that is the* Roman.

Prot. I deſire to know of you, Whether in no caſe a man may ſeparate from the Church whereof he was a member, without Schiſm?

Pop. *Yes certainly, if there be ſufficient cauſe for it; for the Apoſtles did ſeparate from the Church of the* Jews *after Chriſts death; and the Orthodox ſeparated from the* Arrian *Churches, and all Communion with them, yet none ever charged them with Schiſm.*

Prot. Since you mention that inſtance, I pray you tell me, Why they ſeparated from the *Arrians*?

Pop.

Pop *Because they held this Heresie, That Christ was a Creature, and not the true God.*

Prot. Very well; hence then I conclude, That if your Church do hold any heresie, and require all her members to own it too, it is no Schism for us to separate from you.

Pop. *That must needs be granted; but this is but a slander of yours, for our Church holds no such Heresies*

Prot. Your Church doth not hold one, but many dangerous Errors and Heresies, as I do not doubt to manifest ere you and I part; And if you please, we will leave the present Argument to this issue; If I do not prove your Church guilty of Heresie, and the imposition of it too, I am content you should charge us with Schism; If I do, you shall mention it no more.

Pop. *You speak reason, let it rest there.*

Prot. Besides, methinks, you deal barbarously with us, you drive us out from you by your tyranny, and then you blame us for departing; as if *Sarah* had call'd *Hagar* a Schismatick for going out of *Abraham*'s family, from which she forced her; Tell me, I pray you, if the case be so that I must depart from the *Roman* Church, or from God, What must I do?

Pop. *The case is plain, you must rather depart from that Church.*

Prot. This is the Case. If I do not depart from your Church, she will force me to live in many mortal sins. I must believe a hundred lies, I must worship the Cross, and Relicks, and Images, which God Commands me under

under pain of his higheſt diſpleaſure, not to worſhip. I muſt worſhip the Sacrament with Divine worſhip, which I am aſſured is no other for ſubſtance than bread, for your Church is not content to hold theſe opinions, but ſhe enjoyns theſe practices to all her members; and if things be thus, I think you will not have the confidence any more to charge us with Schiſm for obeying the command of God to come out of *Babylon*, ſince you force all your members to partake with you in your ſins, *Revel.* 18. 4. Beſides all this, let me ask you upon what account you charge us with Schiſm?

Pop. *For departing from the Catholick Church, and from your Mother Church of* Rome, *and from the Pope, whoſe Subjects once you were.*

Prot. If then I can prove that we are not departed from the Catholic Church, nor from our Mother Church, nor from any of that ſubjection we owe to the Pope, I hope you will acquit us from Schiſm.

Pop *That I cannot deny.*

Prot. Then this danger is over. For 1 We never did depart from the Catholick Church, which is (not *your particular* Roman *Church*, as you muſt ridiculouſly call it, but (*the whole multitude of Believers, and Chriſtians, in the world*; Nay, the truth is, yon are the Schiſmaticks in renouncing all Communion with all the Chriſtian Churches in the World, except your own (which are equal to yours in number, and many of them far ſuperiour in true Piety); Next; we do not own you for our *Mother*; *Jeruſalem* which is above (not *Babylon* that is beneath).

beneath) is the mother of us all. If we grant you now are a true Church, yet you were but a Siſter Church.

Pop. *You forgot that you received the Goſpel from our Hands.*

Prot. Suppoſe we did really ſo; Doth that give you authority over us? If it did, not *Rome*, but *Jeruſalem* ſhould be the Mother-Church, from whom you alſo received the Goſpel; This you deny; which ſhews that you do not believe your own Argument to be good. And for the Popes Univerſal and Infallible Authority which he pretends over all Chriſtians: I have diligently read your Arguments for it: and I freely profeſs to you, I find your pretences both from Scripture and Fathers, ſo weak and frivolous, that I durſt commend it to any underſtanding and diſintereſted perſon, as a moſt likely means to convince him of the vanity and falſeneſs of that Doctrine, that he would peruſe any of your beſt Authors, and the very ſight of the weakneſs and impertinency of your Arguments would abundantly ſatisfie him of the badneſs of your Cauſe.

Pop. *You have no Miniſters, becauſe you have no uninterrupted ſucceſſion from the Apoſtles, as we have, and therefore you have no Church, and therefore no Salvation.*

Prot. I obſerve you take the ſame courſe that the Adverſaries of the Goſpel ever did, who when they could not reprove the Doctrine of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, they quarrelled with them for want of a Calling, as you may ſee, *Joh.* 1. 25. *Matt.* 21. 23. *Act.* 4 7. But the good Chriſtians *of that time* took another courſe,

courſe, and examined not ſo much the Call of the perſons, as the truth of the Doctrine, *Act.* 8. 17. It ſeems to me a ſecret confeſſion of your guilt, and the Error of your Doctrine, that you are ſo careful to turn off mens eyes from that to a far meaner point. But tell me, Do you believe that ſuch an uninterrupted Succeſſion of Miniſters from the Apoſtles, is abſolutely neceſſary to the being of a Church?

Pop. *Yes verily, or elſe this Argument ſignifies nothing.*

Prot. How then can you convince me or any other Chriſtian, that you have had ſuch an uninterrupted Succeſſion in your Church? You muſt produce, and, it ſeems, I muſt read all thoſe many hundreds of great Volumes wherein ſuch paſſages are mentioned. In thoſe you muſt ſhew me a perfect Catalogue of the ſeveral names of thoſe Popes, and others who have without interruption ſucceeded one another ever ſince the Apoſtles days; and this Catalogue muſt be ſuch that all your Authors are agreed in (whereas I am told for certain, they differ very much in their reports therein, and are not ſo much as agreed among themſelves who was *Peter's* next Succeſſor, whether *Linus* or *Clemens*, or ſome other perſon they know not who) and thoſe Hiſtorians that report theſe things, you muſt aſſure me that they were infallible (which you do not pretend they were) or elſe they might miſtake the things themſelves, and miſreport them to me; and I have heard and read, that there have been divers Corruptions.

and

and Schiſms even in your Church, one Pope ſet up againſt another, and each pretending to be the true Pope, and diſannulling all the acts of the other; and that the Chriſtian people were then wofully divided, ſome cleaving to one, others to another; but it may be this was a Miſtake of our Miniſters; therefore tell me, Was this true or no?

Pop. *I confeſs it was true, after the year of Chriſt* 1300, *there were ſeveral Popes at the ſame time, one at* Rome, *another at* Avignon.

Prot. And how long did this difference laſt?

Pop. *For about* 50 *Years.*

Prot. And is it true that I have heard, that your great *Baronius* reports, that *for* 150 *years together, the Popes were rather Apoſtates than Apoſtolicks: and that they were thruſt into the Papal Chair by the power of Harlots, and the violences of the Princes of* Tuſcany?

Pop. *I muſt be true to you,* Baronius *doth ſay ſo at the year* 897.

Prot. Then never henceforward be ſo impudent to pretend to ſuch a lawful, clear and uninterrupted Succeſſion; but bluſh that ever you mentioned it. But beſides, I have heard that divers of our firſt reformed and reforming Miniſters too, were ſuch as had received Ordination from, and in the Church of *Rome*, and from your Biſhops. Is it true? or is it not?

Pop. *I will be ingenous, Our Doctors confeſs it: but if your Miniſters or ſome of them had a call from our Church, yet they were only called to preach, not to overturn the world as they did) & undertake*

undertake the Reformation of the whole Church.

Prot You have said enough: if they were called to the Ministry, their Work and Office was to bear witness to the Truth: and therefore to undeceive the World in those many Errors and Heresies which you had brought into the Church, and ministers are set for the defence of the Gospel: they were therefore bound by their Office to endeavour the Reformation of the Church, and Salvation of Souls: and as in a great Fire (especially where public Officers neglect their Duty) every man brings his Bucket to quench it; so, in that miserable estate into which you had brought the Church (when the Pope and Bishops would not do their duty) it was the duty of every Minister to endeavour, and to stir up the Kings and Magistrates of the World to endeavour a Reformation. Surely you cannot pretend to an higher Priviledg than St. *Paul*, and yet he gives all Ministers and Christians this leave and charge, that *if he himself should bring any other Doctrine than what he had delivered*, any Minister (though happily such a one as received his calling from him) or Christian might not only forsake him, but *judg him accursed*. I shall only add this, our Ministers are in a very hard case. I have discoursed with *Anabaptists*, who have reasoned against our Ministers as no Ministers, because they had their calling from *Rome*; and now you will make them no Ministers, because they had no Calling from *Rome*. (How shall they please you and them too?) But what have you further to say?

Pop.

Pop. *I have this further* (*which is indeed unanſwerable*) *namely, the horrible diviſions of, and in your Churches: Here is* Lutheran *and* Calviniſt, Epiſcopal *and* Preſbyterian, Independent *and* Anabaptiſt, *and* Quaker *and* Socinian *and* Familiſt; *and what not? ſo that a man that would turn to your Church, knows not which to turn to: but our Church is one and entire, at perfect unity in it ſelf.*

Prot. I pray you tell me in the firſt place, Are diviſions a certain Argument to prove any Church not to be true?

Pop. *I cannot ſay ſo; for it is plain, the Jewiſh-Church in Chriſts time was full of Diviſions; there were Phariſees, Sadduces, Eſſenes,* &c. *And ſo was the Church of* Corinth *in St.* Paul's *time, while ſome ſaid,* I am of Paul; *others,* I of Apollo; *others,* I of Cephas; *and ſome denyed* Pauls *Miniſtry and Apoſtleſhip, and ſome denyed the Reſurrection.*

Prot. Very well, then you may bluſh to uſe ſuch an Argument; I am told that the old Heathens did uſe this very Argument againſt the primitive Chriſtians.

Pop. *It is true, they did.*

Prot. What a ſhame is it that you are forced to defend your Cauſe with ſuch Weapons as were uſed by the Pagans, and wreſted out of their hands by the Ancient Fathers?

But beſides, you talk of our Diviſions, I pray you let me ask you, will you allow me to Father all the opinions of every Papiſt I read or talk with, upon your Church?

Pop. *No, in no wiſe; Let our Church ſpeak for her ſelf. It is one great fault of your Miniſters,*

they

they catch up every particular Opinion of any private Doctor, and preſently charge our Church with it; tho it be ſuch as ſhe hath condemned: whereas they ſhould judg of our Church only by her own Decrees and Councils

Prot. Very well, I deſire only the ſame Juſtice from you: Do not father upon our Church thoſe Opinions which ſhe diſlikes and abhors: *Socinians*, *Quakers*, &c. are yours rather than ours, and joyn with you in abundance of your Doctrines: Judg of our Churches by their publick Confeſſions, and there alſo you would find, that our Diviſions are generally inconſiderable, being almoſt all about a form of Government, or oft-times, but a manner of Expreſſion, and none of them in Fundamental Points. But ſince you talk of Diviſions, let me ask you, Are all the Members of your Church of one mind? I have been told otherwiſe. We hear great talk every day of the difference between the Janſeniſts and the Jeſuits: and (if we may believe either of them) it is a Fundamental difference, and ſuch as concerns the very life of Religion. I will not trouble you with other things: But are you agreed in that, which is the Foundation of your Unity, I mean, Concerning the ſupreme Infallible Judg of Controverſies? I remembar your ſelf told me, that ſome of you thought it was the Pope, and others a Council. And I have read, that Popiſh Nations, and Univerſities, and Doctors, are altogether divided about it: and for the Pope, I have heard that *Bellarmine* reckons up the ſeveral Opinions, and amongſt others, that the Pope (if he be without a General Council)

may

may be an Heretick and teach Hereſie; and this (ſaith he) *is the Opinion of divers Papiſts, and is determined by a Pope himſelf,* Adrian *the* 6th *by name in his queſtion about Confirmation*: is this true, or is *Bellarmine* be ly'd?

Pop. *It is true,* Bellarmine *doth ſay ſo much*: * *and moreover, that* this opinion is not Heretical, and is tolerated by the Church; *but withall he tells you, that he is of another opinion, which is alſo the common opinion.*

Prot. However, that is ſufficient for my purpoſe; this one difference among you, being far more conſiderable than all thoſe points wherein Proteſtants differ among themſelves: for though they differ in other and leſſer things, they all agree in this great means of Union, that they own the Holy Scriptures to be the *Judg* (or more properly the *Rule*) of Controverſies; and therefore if you pleaſe, let this paſs, and let me hear what further you have to ſay againſt us, for your ſelves?

Pop. *This further I ſay, the true Church muſt needs remain viſible perpetually to the end of the World, ſuch our Church hath been; whereas yours was inviſible, and* (*as I ſaid before*) *unheard of in the World till* Luther's *days.*

Prot. I do not well underſtand you; do you think the Church muſt needs be viſible at all times to the whole World?

Pop. *I cannot ſay ſo, for ſhe was not always viſible to many great and famous parts of the world,* as China, *and* America; *it may ſuffice, that ſhe is viſible in ſome Kingdom or part of the world,*

* *De Pontific.* I. 4. c. 2.

and

and that she remains so in all ages.

Prot. Then the Church may remain invisible to the greatest part of the world, and so your Argument reacheth but a small part of the World: How I pray you must the Church be always visible?

Pop. There must be in all ages, in some eminent place, a great company of Christians visibly united together in the worship of God in one Body and Congregation, and governed by their successive Pastors under the Pope.

Prot. Very well: Now I know your mind: And first I deny, that it is necessary for the true Church to be so visible in all ages: Do you prove it.

Pop. *That I shall easily prove, from those many and glorious promises made to the Church; the Church is called a great* Mountain, *and said to be* exalted above other Mountains, *Isa.* 2. *She is a* City set upon a hill that cannot be hid, *Mat.* 5. *Christ hath promised* to be with her to the end of the World, *Mat.* 28. The gates of Hell shall not prevail against her. Christs Kingdom is an everlasting Kingdom, *Psal.* 88. *Dan.* 2. *A few invisible and dispersed Christians, cannot make a Kingdom.*

Prot. Your Proofs are impertinent; *Isa.* 2. doth prove, that the Church under the New Testament, should be glorious (that is spiritually) and prevalent; so it was (and we trust will be; but he saith not, the Church should always continue in that condition (which is the point that you should prove). *Mat.* 5 if it spake of the Church, Christ only tells us what the Church then was, not that it should always remain

remain such: besides, he speaks of their duty, not their condition; and *Mat.* 28. proves, that Christ will be with his Church, but not so as that it shall always be illustrious and united in a great body; this, neither that, nor any of your other Texts prove, nor can you. But suppose that Christ had made such a promise, that his Church should be visible in all ages in a considerable body; how do you prove that our Church hath not been so visible in all ages?

Pop. *If you affirm that it hath been visible in all Ages, you are bound to produce a Catalogue of your Churches in all successive Ages.*

Prot. That is not necessary neither; If I did positively affirm that our Church had been visible in such manner in all ages, then I confess I am bound to prove it. But if I leave it in doubt as a thing which (for ought you or I know) might be true or false, he that affirms it was not so, is bound to make it good; and if I deny your Proposition, by all Laws of dispute, you must prove it; I will shew by an instance, how unconvincing your argument is; There are several Prophesies and Promises in Scripture, the execution whereof is not Recorded there, nor any where else; suppose an Atheist comes to you, and offers this argument against the Scripture, If the Scripture be true, and the Word of God, then all its Prophesies and Promises were accomplisht; but there are several Prophesies and Promises there which never were accomplished within the time appointed, therefore it is not true: What would you answer?

Pop. *I would deny this propoſition,* viz. *That there are any ſuch Propheſies or Promiſes there which were not accompliſht.*

Prot. Suppoſe then he urge it thus, If they were accompliſht, then you muſt ſhew when and how they were accompliſht either in Scripture or other ſtories; if you cannot, I ſhall conclude they never were accompliſht.

Pop. *I ſhould tell him, that he is obliged to ſhew that they were not accompliſht: nor do I ſhew that they were accompliſht: I ſhould tell him that they might be accompliſht, tho the accompliſhment of them were never put into any writing (and being but an Hiſtorical Tradition, might eaſily be loſt) or if it were put into writing, that alſo might be loſt by the injury of time, as thouſands of other books have been; ſo that no prudent man will believe this mad Propoſition, that nothing was done in former Ages, that was not mentioned in the Records which we have. But if it were poſſible that ſome particular things were not recorded, or were loſt, yet it is not probable that ſo eminent and publick a matter as a ſucceſſion of Churches ſhould lye hid.*

Prot. I confeſs it is not ſo probable that a large and glorious Church ſhould ſo lye hid; but ſince it was ſufficient for the making good of Chriſts Promiſe of being ever with his Church: If there were ſome few Congregations and Miniſters, though ſcattered in divers places, that theſe ſhould not be Recorded, is not at all ſtrange nor improbable to any one who conſiders, 1. How many matters of far greater note are Recorded only in ſome ſingle Author, which if he had been loſt (and that he was as liable to, as they that were loſt) the

the memory of those things had perished with him. 2. How wofully dark and ignorant some Ages of the Church were, as you all confess, wherein there was not much reading; but to be sure, there was little or no writing, and that little was written, was written by men of the times, who would not do their Enemies that Honour or Right to put them into their Histories. 3. If any did mention such things, it is not at all improbable, that such Book or Books wherein they were Recorded, might either be lost by the injury of time, (as thousands of other Books were) which was much more easie before Printing was found out, or suppressed by the tyranny of your Predecessors, who made it their business, (as *Israels* enemies of old) that the name and remembrance of true Christians might be blotted out of the earth. So then, if Christ did indeed Promise the perpetual Visibility of his Church, I will conclude he made it good, though History be silent in the Point; nor will I conclude it was not done, because it is not Recorded: But I pray you let me further ask you, Is it true that I am told, that in the former Ages, there were many Christians and Ministers whom your Church did persecute and burn for Hereticks?

Pop. *That cannot be denyed.*

Prot. This shews there were not wanting even in former Ages, some that testified against your Corruptions; and this was a sign they were the true Church, (whose office it is *to contend for the Faith delivered to the Saints*) for these things were not done in a corner. I am

told that your great *Bellarmine*, when it was objected against him that the Church was obscure in St. *Hillaries* days, answers, that *tho the true Church may be obscure by multitude of Scandals, yet even then it is visible in its strongest members, as then it was in* Athanasius, Hillary, Eusebius, and two or three more whom he mentions: * Whence I gather, that some few eminent Preachers and Professors of the Truth, are sufficient to keep up this Visibility: I remember I have read in the History of the *Waldenses*, who (tho your Predecessors branded them with odious Names and Opinions, yet) do sufficiently appear to have been a company of Orthodox and serious Christians, and indeed true Protestants; these began about 500 Years ago, saith your *Genebrard* *; and your *Reinerius*, who was one of their cruel Butchers, (otherwise called Inquisitors) writeth thus of them; *This Sect* (saith he) *is the most pernicious of all others, for three causes.* 1. *Because it is of long continuance, some say that it hath endured from the time of* Sylvester; *others from the time of the Apostles. The 2d is, because it is more general, for there is almost no land in which this Sect doth not creep.* 3. *That whereas all others by the immanity of their blasphemies against God, do make men abhor them, these have a great shew of godliness, because they do live justly before men, and believe all things well of God, and all the Articles which are contained in the Creed; only the Church of* Rome *they do blaspheme*

* *De Ecclesia militante, l.* 3. *c.* 16. * *Chron.*

and

and hate. Behold here out of your own mouths a plain confutation of your objection, and a testimony of the perpetuity, amplitude, visibility, and sanctity of our Church: for it is sufficiently known that our Church and Doctrine is for substance the same with theirs. Now tell me, I pray you, if this History of them had been lost, and no other mention of them made in other Records, Had it been a truth for you to affirm, that there never were any such men and Churches in that time?

Pop. *No surely, for the recording of things in History doth not make them true, nor the silence of Histories about true Occurrences, make them false.*

Prot. Then there might be the like Companies and Congregations in former ages for ought you or I know; nor can you argue from the defect of an History, to the denial of the thing; And all this I say, not as if there were no Records which mention our Church in former Ages: (for as I said before, it is sufficiently evident, that all our material Doctrines have been constantly and successively owned by a considerable number of persons in several Ages) but only that you may see there is a flaw in the very foundation of your argument. Moreover, I find in Scripture, several instances of such times when the Church was as much obscured, and invisible, as ever our Church was: as when *Israel* was in *Egypt*, so oft times under the Judges, *Judg.* 2. 3. and so under divers of the Kings, as *Ahab*, when *Elijah* complained he was left alone, and the 7000 which were reserved, though known to God, were invi-

ſible to the Prophet, and under *Ahaz* and *Manaſſeh*, and ſo in the *Babyloniſh* captivity; and ſo under *Antiocus*; read at thy leiſure, 2 *Chron.* 15.3. 28.24. 29 6.7. 33. 3,4. ſo in the New-Teſtament, how obſcure, and in a manner inviſible, was the Chriſtian Church for a ſeaſon? Nay, let me add, This perpetual viſibility and ſplendour is ſo far from being a note of the true Church, that on the contrary, it is rather a ſign that yours is not the true Church, as appears thus: Chriſt hath foretold the obſcurity and ſmallneſs of his Church in ſome after Ages; he tells us that there ſhall be a general Apoſtaſie and Defection from the Faith, 2 *Theſ.* 2. 1. 1 *Tim.* 4. I read of a Woman, *Rev.* 12. and ſhe is forced to flee into the Wilderneſs; and I am told your own expoſitors agree with us, that this is the Church which flees from Antichriſt into the Wilderneſs, and ſecret places, withdrawing her ſelf from perſecution. Is this true?

Pop. *I muſt confeſs our Authors do take it ſo.*

Prot. Then it ſeems you do not believe your ſelves, when you plead the neceſſity of perpetual viſibility and ſplendour: for here you acknowledg her obſcurity; and really, this Place and Diſcourſe of yours does very much confirm me, that the obſcurity which you object againſt us, is an argument that ours is the true Church; though, according to this Prediction, the Pope is Antichriſt, and did drive our Predeceſſors into the Wilderneſs. I read of *a Beaſt riſing out of the Sea*, Rev. 13. which your own Authors, *Menochius*, *Terinus*, and

and almost all Expositors (as *Riberas* saith) acgnowledg to be Antichrist; and this Beast *all the inhabitants of the world do worship, except those whose names are written in the Book of life*, verse 8. that is, excepting only the invisible Church; if any Church be visible and glorious at that time, it must be the false and Antichristian Church; and now I speak of that, I have heard that you your selves confess, that in the time of Antichrist, the Church shall be obscure, and all public worship in the Churches of Christians, shall be forbidden and cease; Is it so?

Pop. *It is true, it shall be so,* i. e. *during the time of Antichrists reign, as* Bellarmine *acknowledgeth; but that is only for a short moment: for three years and a half, which is all the time that Antichrist shall reign.*

Prot. I thank you for this, for now you have exceedingly confirmed me in the truth of my Religion; for since you grant that the Church shall be obscure during Antichrists reign, I am veey well assured that your opinion of the Trienial reign of Antichrist, is but a dream; and that he was to reign in the Church for many hundred of years, for 1260 *days*, *Rev.* 11. 3. and 12. 6. (that is, *years*, it being a very familiar thing to put *days* for *years*, in Prophetical Writings). But if the Church may be obscured for three *years*, why not for thirty, yea, three hundred? Did Christ in his supposed Promise of perpetual visibility in the Church, make an exception for these three *years*? I trow not; and tell me, I pray you, should you live till that time when Antichrist shall preval

prevail, and your Religion no leſs than ours be obſcure and inviſible; if any of the followers of Antichriſt ſhould diſpute againſt you, that yours was not the true Church, becauſe not viſible, would you grant it?

Pop. *God forbid I ſhould be ſo wicked to deny my Mother, and Church, becauſe of her Affliction.*

Prot. Then I ſee you your ſelves do not believe this to be a good argument, and that you do not make perpetual viſibility a neceſſary token of the true Church. To this I add, there is no need we ſhould ſhew a conſtant ſucceſſion of Proteſtant Churches ever ſince the Apoſtles days, (as you pretend is neceſſary) the ſucceſſion that you pretend in your Church, is ſufficient for ours; and ſo long as we generally agree, that your Church was a true Church (till latter years) though wofully corrupted, and our Predeceſſors continued in it, till your wounds ſtunk and became incurable, we need no other ſucceſſion than yours; but when your impiety came to the height, then we viſibly departed from you, and have given ſuch reaſons for it, as you will never be able to anſwer. In the mean time let me hear what you have further to ſay.

Pop *For as much as all your miniſters confeſs our Church was once a true Church, I pray you tell me how, and when ſhe did fall? you cannot tell either the time when ſhe fell, or the manner how, by Apoſtacy, or Hereſie, or Schiſm: if you can, name your Authors.*

Prot. This is a moſt unreaſonable demand: A Friend of mine had the plague laſt year, and died of it; I aſk him when he was ſick, how

how and when he got it? he ſaid, he knew not: Shall I then conclude he had it not? ſhall I make Chriſt a Lyar, and diſpute that there were no tares, becauſe they were *ſown when men ſlept*, Mat. 13 25, and ſo could not know when or how they came? Shall I believe no Hereſie to be an Hereſie, unleſs I can ſhew how and when it came into the Church? What if the Records of theſe things by the injury of time are loſt, and their original left in obſcurity: ſhall I therefore ſay, it is now become no Hereſie? I beſeech you anſwer me freely this queſtion: Suppoſe I could bring plain and ſtrong evidences from the holy Scripture, and from ancient Tradition, or the unanimous teſtimonies of the Ancient Fathers, that your Doctrine of Merits (for inſtance) is an Hereſie, your doctrine of worſhipping Images is Idolatry, and that you are in divers particulars apoſtatized from that Faith which the Scriptures and Fathers do own: in this cauſe, would you not confeſs, that you are guilty of Idolatry, Hereſie, and Apoſtacy?

Pop. *If it were ſo, and you could really bring (as you falſly pretend you can, but indeed cannot) any ſuch ſolid proofs, I muſt and will confeſs it: For all our writers agree, that although we muſt believe many things that are not contained in the Scripture, yet we muſt believe nothing contrary to the Scriptuers, nor to the conſent of the ancient Fathers.*

Prot. Very well; hence then I gather, that the only queſtion between you and me is, Whether we can evidently and ſolidly prove the particulars now mentioned, which if we

can do, as I am ſatisfied our Miniſters have done, you are convicted in your own Conſcience, and will confeſs your ſelf and your Church guilty of Hereſie, Idolatry, and Apoſtacy, whether I can tell the manner or time, or Authors of this Doctrine, or no.

Therefore leaving theſe frivolous and impertinent queſtions, let me hear what you have to ſay more againſt our Religion; and whereas your diſcourſe I obſerve hath wholly run upon Generals, I beſeech you come to ſome particulars, and ſhew me the falſhood of the Doctrines of our Church. But it doth not a little confirm me in my Religion, that you confeſs (as I ſhewed before) moſt of our Doctrines to be true and grounded upon Scripture, whereas yours are additions of your own deviſing. Now if things be thus, you ſhall not need to trouble your ſelf about many particulars; but if you pleaſe, ſingle our ſome of our principal Hereſies, (as you call them) and let me hear what evidinces you can bring againſt them.

Pop. *Your Hereſies are very many, but I ſhall mention one, which may be inſtead of all, and that is your Rule of Faith and Judg of controverſies which you make to be the Scripture only.*

Prot. I am glad you have fallen upon ſo material a point, the deciding whereof may make other Diſputes in great part uſeleſs. Tell me then what you have to ſay againſt this Doctrine.

Pop. *I will urge four Arguments againſt it. 1. Scripture hath no Authority over us, but from the Church. 2. You cannot know what Books are the*

the Holy Scriptures, or part of it, but by the Churches Report. 3. If neither of these were true, yet Scripture is not a sufficient rule for your Faith without Tradition. 4. If it were sufficient, yet it is so obscure, that you cannot know the sense of it without the interpretation of the Church. You see here is a fourfold cord, which you will find is not easily broken.

Prot. Make these things good, and I confess you do your work in a great measure. Let me hear your Proofs

Pop *For the first then, I say, that Scripture hath no Authority over us but from the Church; neither you nor I are bound to believe the Scripture to be the word of God, nor can any man know it or prove it to be so, but from the testimony of our Church concerning it.*

Prot. I pray tell me if you were to discourse with an Atheist, who utterly denies the Holy Scriptures, and the Church too, Could you not prove against him that the Scriptures are the Word of God?

Pop *God forbid but that I should be able to defend the truth of the Scriptures against any adversary whatsoever.*

Prot. How then I pray you would you prove it?

Pop *I need not tell you the Arguments which in this case our Doctors use, and I stand by them in it; they alledg for the truth of the holy Scriptures, the testimony of all ages and all sort of persons, the miracles wrought for it, acknowledg'd even by the enemies of it, the martyrdom that so many thousands (& many of the most wise & learned men) did run upon in the defence of them, the living so near that we*

of the writing of them, were able to diſcern the truth) and the wonderful power that goes along with them in convincing, converting, and comforting or terrifying ſinners.

Prot. Do you believe theſe are ſolid Arguments, and that the Atheiſt ought to yield to them?

Pop. *Yes doubtleſs, for every man is bound to receive the truth, eſpecially when it is ſo propoſed and proved to him.*

Prot. It ſeems then by this, when you liſt, you can prove the Scripture to be the word of God without taking in the Churches Authority; I hope you will allow me the ſame benefit. But again let me ask you, Your Church that you talk of, which believes the Scripture to be the word of God; Doth ſhe believe it to be the word of God upon ſolid grounds, or no?

Pop. *Yes doubtleſs, our Church is not ſo irrational as to believe without grounds; nor do we pretend Revelation; but ſhe believes it upon ſolid Arguments.*

Prot. I wiſh you would give me a liſt of their Arguments; But whatever they be that are ſufficient to convince your Church, why ſhould they not be ſufficient to convince any private man, Popiſh, or Proteſtant, or Atheiſt? And therefore there is no need of the Churches teſtimony. Or will you ſay, the Church hath no other ſufficient reaſon to believe the Scriptures but her own teſtimony, *that is*, ſhe believes becauſe ſhe will believe?

Pop. *God forbid that I ſhould diſparage the Church, or give Atheiſts that occaſion to ſcoff at the Scripture.*

Prot.

Prot. Then I alſo may be ſatisfied without the Churches teſtimony, that the Scriptures are the word of God; and I am ſo, by ſuch Arguments as your ſelf mentioned; but really I cannot but ſmile to ſee what cunning Sophiſters you are, how you play at faſt and looſe; The ſame Arguments for the Scriptures are ſtrong and undeniable when you talk with an Atheiſt, and are all of a ſudden become weak as Water when a Proteſtant brings them.

Pop. *But if you can prove in the general, that the Scriptures are the Word of God, yet you cannot without the Churches Authority, tell what Books are Scripture, or which are Canonical, and ſo you are never the nearer.*

Prot. Here alſo I muſt ask you again; How doth your Church know which Books are Scripture and Canonical? Doth ſhe know this by Revelation?

Pop. *No, we leave ſuch fancies to your Church.*

Prot. How then doth ſhe know this? and why doth ſhe determine it? Is it with reaſon or without it?

Pop. *With Reaſon doubtleſs, being induced to believe and determine it upon clear and undoubted Evidence?*

Prot. I pray you tell me what are thoſe Evidences upon which ſhe goes?

Pop *I will be true to you, our great* Bellarmine *mentions theſe three*, The Church (*ſaith he*) knows and declares a Canonical Book, 1. From the teſtimonies of the Ancients. 2. From its likeneſs and agreement with other Books. 3. From

3. From the common ſenſe and taſte of Chriſtian people *.

Prot. Since a private man (eſpecially one that beſides Learning and Experience, hath the Spirit of God to guide him, which is that anointing given to all Believers, which teaches them all things, 1 *Joh.* 2. 27.) may examine and apprehend theſe things as well as the Pope himſelf, (and better too, conſidering what kind of creatures divers of your Popes, are confeſt to have been) he may therefore know without the Churches Authority, what Books are indeed Canonical; But I pray you tell me, Do not you acknowledg thoſe Books to be the Word of God which we do, that are in this Bible?

Pop. *I muſt be true to you, we do own every Book you have there; but you ſhould receive the Books which you call Apocryphal; ſo that indeed your Bible is not compleat, for you believe but a part of the written Word of God, which I muſt tell you is of dangerous conſequence.*

Prot. If theſe Books be a part of Gods Word, I confeſs we are guilty of a great ſin, in taking away from Gods Word; and if they be not, you are no leſs guilty in adding to it; ſo that the only queſtion is, Whether theſe Books be a part of the Holy Scripture or no; Now if you pleaſe, we will try *Bellarmines* rules.

Pop. *The Motion is fair and reaſonable.*

Prot. Firſt then, for the Judgment of the Ancient Church, let us try that; I know you hold the Churches Judgment Infallible, eſ-

* *De Verbo Dei*, l. 1. c. 10. *Itaq; non decimus.*

pecially,

pecially in matters of this moment; and I ſuppoſe you think the *Jewiſh* Church was infallible before Chriſt, as the Chriſtian Church now is.

Pop. *We do ſo and the Infallibility of the Jewiſh Church and high Prieſt,* Deut. 17. *is one of our Principal Arguments for the Infallibility of our Church.* (a)

Prot. Then only theſe Books of the Old Teſtament were Canonical, which the *Jewiſh* Church did own.

Pop. *That muſt neceſſarily follow.*

Prot. Then your cauſe is loſt; for it is certain, the Jews rejected theſe Apocryphal Books which you receive; and they reckoned only 22. *Joſephus* his words (acknowledged for *his* by *Euſebius*, (b) are moſt expreſs for us, *The Jews have only* 22 *Books, to which they deſervedly give credit, which contains things written from the beginning of the World to the times of* Artaxerxes; *other things were written afterward* (ſo the Apocryphal Books are granted to have been) *but they are not of the ſame credit with the former, becauſe there was no certain ſucceſſion of Prophets;* (c) and I am told divers of your learned Authors confeſs it, as *Catharinus*, (d) *Coſterus* (e) *Marianus Victor*, (f) and *Bellarmine* himſelf, whoſe words are theſe; *All thoſe Books which the Proteſtants do not receive, the*

(a) See *Nullity of Rom. faith. ch.* 2. (b) *Hiſt. l.* 3. 10. (c) *Contra Appionem*, lib. 1. (d) *In Annot. adverſus Cajet. de libris Maccab.* (e) *Enchir. c. de ſcrip. de num. lib.* (f) *In Scholiis ad Ep. ſt.* 116. *Hieronymi.*

Jews

Jews alſo did not receive : (g) and this is more conſiderable, becauſe *to the Jews were committed the Oracles of God*, Rom. 3. 2. And neither Chriſt nor his Apoſtles did accuſe them of breach of truſt in this matter. Moreover, I am told (and ſurely in all reaſon it muſt needs be true) that the Canonical Books of the *Jewiſh* Church were written in the *Jewiſh* or *Hebrew* Language, whereas theſe were written in *Greek* only. Are theſe things ſo?

Pop. *What is true I will acknowledg*; *It is ſo*; *The* Jewiſh *Church indeed did not receive them, nor yet did they reject them as our* Canus *well anſwers.* (h)

Prot. Either that Church did believe them to be Canonical, or they did *not*; if they did, then they lived in a mortal ſin againſt Conſcience in not receiving them; if they did not, they were of our opinion.

Pop *Well, whatſoever the* Jewiſh *Church did, I am ſure the ancient Chriſtians and Fathers did receive theſe Books as a part of the Canonical Scripture.*

Prot. I doubt I ſhall take you tardy there too; I am told that the Council of *Laodicea*, (in the year of our Lord 364) drew up a Catalogue of the Books of the Scripture, in which (as in ours) the Apocryphal Books are rejected.

Pop. *It is true, they did not receive them, nor yet reject them.*

Prot. If they did not receive them, that un-

(g) *De Verbo Dei*, l. 1. c. 10. *In principio.* (h) *Lic. Theol.* l 2. c. 11.

denably

deniably ſhews that they did not believe them to be Canonical, and yet they diligently ſcanned the point, and the Books had then been extant ſome hundreds of Years, and they were far more likely to know the Truth than we at this diſtance, having then ſuch ſpecial opportunities of knowing the Judgment of the ancient Church, both *Jewiſh* and *Chriſtian*; beſides, I am informed that the famous Biſhop of *Sardis*, *Melito*, (a man of great Judgment and Venerable Holineſs, as your *Sixtus Sinenſis* ſaid) did take a journey to the Eaſtern Churches (where the Apoſtles principally preached) to find out the true Canon of the Scripture, and returned with the ſame Canon that we own; but for the Apocrypha, brought home a *Non eſt inventus*; And moreover, that divers of your greateſt Champions do confeſs, that a great number of the Ancient Fathers were of our opinion, among which themſelves reckon *Melito*, *Origen*, *Athanaſius*, *Euſebius*, *Ruffinus*, *Hierom* and *Amphilotius*; ſo ſay *Canus* and *Bellarmine*, and *Andradius*; and in the general, *Sixtus Sinenſis* confeſſeth, that the *Ancient Fathers were of our opinion.* Are theſe things ſo?

Pop. *I will not deny the truth, it is ſo; but you muſt know, that other Fathers were of another mind, as* Clemens, Cyprian, *and* Ambroſe: *and eſpecially St.* Auſtin *and the Council of* Carthage.

Prot. The Fathers of our opinion, were both far more numerous, and ſuch as lived neareſt the Apoſtolical Times and Churches: The Council of *Laodicea* was more ancient than that of *Carthage* (and therefore of greater Authority); and beſides, the ſixth Council of *Conſtantinople*,

ſtantinople doth expreſly confirm all the Decrees of the Council of *Laodicea*, (amongſt which this was one); and the Council of *Carthage* too, doth not your work: For in their Catalogue there is both more than you own, to wit, the third Book of *Eſdras* (although they call it the ſecond, as the *Greeks* did); and leſs too, for they ſhut out *Baruch* and the *Maccabees*. But beſides all this, I am told, that very many of your moſt eminent Doctors have diſowned theſe Books which we reject, as the *Pariſian* Divines, and Cardinal *Xominus*, with the *Complutenſian* Univerſity, and *Aquinas*, and *Lyca*, and *Pagnim*, and many other. Is it ſo?

Pop. *I confeſs this is true* *.

Prot. Then I am ſure this may ſatisfie any rational man, concerning the Teſtimony of the Ancient Church; and for the next point, *viz* their agreement with the Canonical Books, I think it is plain enough that they do groſly contradict them, and the Truth too; that fact of *Simeon* and *Levi*, which good *Jacob* (acted by Gods Spirit) deteſteth, *Judith* commends, *Chap.* 14; whereas if he ſaid true, he muſt have lived twice as long, for he ſaid he was taken captive by *Salmanaſſer*, Chap. 1. and 2. and 14. and when he was about to dye, he ſaith, the time was near for the return of the *Iſraelites* from the Captivity, and the rebuilding of the Temple which was burn'd; If the Books of the

---

* *Rainoldus* in his Prelections concerning the Apocryphal Books, proves this out of their own words, ſee *Prælect.* 40. 41, 42, 43.

Maccabees

Maccabees say true, *Antiochus* his Soul had a Lease of his body for three Lives, and he was killed thrice over (I commend the Author, he was resolved to make sure work of him). 1. He dyes at *Babylon* in his Bed, 1 *Mac.* 2. 6. then he is stoned in the Temple of *Nanea*, 2 *Mac.* 1. Lastly, he dyes in the Mountains by a fall out of his Chariot, 2 *Mac* 9 And the fine ferches of your Authors to reconcile these gross contradictions, put me in mind of a story we heard at School (if you remember) of a Gentleman that told this lye *, That he shot a Deer at one shot through his right ear, and left hinder leg, and you know how hard his man was put to it, to help his Master out. But I will not lanch forth into the Sea of Untruths and Absurdities that are contained in those Books; these may suffice to shew you, that we do not without warrant reject them; but howsoever it is sufficient for my purpose, that you grant that my Bible is the word of God, and these Books in it Canonical, and I can know this without the Churches Authority.

Pop. *Do not make too much haste; If I do grant that these Books in the Original language are the word of God, yet yours is but a translation.*

Prot. Is it rightly translated for the substance, or is it not? What Bible is that which you have?

Pop. *A Latin Bible.*

Prot. Is that the word of God, and rightly translated?

---

* See *Rainoldus & Spanhem. de libris Apocryphis.*

Pop.

Pop. *Yes, the Council of* Trent *hath decreed ſo.*

Prot. Then I pray you let us try this Experiment; do you pick out any 20 verſes in ſeveral parts of the Bible, and turn them into Engliſh out of your Bible.

Pop *The motion is fair, I will do it.*

Prot. I do not find any ſubſtantial difference in all theſe places between your Tranſlation and mine; the difference is wholly in words, not at all in ſenſe; ſo now, I thank you for this occaſion, for I have heard ſome of your Prieſts ranting highly againſt our Tranſlation; and now I ſee they have no cauſe for it.

Pop. *If all this were over, yet the Scripture is not a ſufficient Rule to guide you to Heaven of it ſelf, without Tradition.*

Prot. Why ſo, I beſeech you?

Pop. *Becauſe you are alſo commanded there to hold the Tradition; turn in your Bible to* 2 *Theſſ.* 2.15 Hold the Traditions which you have been taught, whether by Word or Epiſtle.

Prot. How do you prove that he ſpeaks of ſuch Traditions as were not written in the Scripture?

Pop. *Becauſe he ſo plainly diſtinguiſheth between what he taught them by Word, and what he taught them by Epiſtle or Writing.*

Prot. That may be true that he ſpeaks of ſome things of which he had not written to them, and yet they might be written by him to others, or by others, at leaſt after that time; but beſides, notwithſtanding this diſtinction between Word and Epiſtle, divers of your own Authors affirm, that Tradition is perfect,

and

and that St. *Paul* taught all things neceſſary by word of mouth; and why may not I as well ſay, that he taught all by Epiſtle? But I pray you, What do you mean by theſe traditions?

Pop. *I mean all the Traditions which either he, or any other Apoſtle did deliver: all theſe you are bound to receive.*

Prot. I will not quarrel with you for that; bring me ſolid proofs of any of your unwritten Traditions, that they did indeed come from the Apoſtles, I promiſe you I will joyfully receive them: But I pray you, what are theſe Traditions you ſpeak of?

Pop. *Such as theſe, The Doctrine of Purgatory, Invocation of Saints, of the Popes Supremacy, of the ſingle life of Prieſts, of the Faſts of the Church, Private Maſſes, worſhip of Images,* &c.

Prot. And do you think that all that did not believe and receive theſe Traditions, ſhall be damned?

Pop. *No, by no means; for then I ſhould condemn many of the Holy Fathers and Martyrs, who differed from us at leaſt in ſome of theſe Points.*

Prot. Then it is not neceſſary to ſalvation to receive theſe Traditions; and the Scripture may be ſufficient without them: But further, Theſe unwritten Traditions you talk of, I beſeech you how came you to diſcover them, and diſcern the true from the falſe?

Pop. *I altogether approve of* Bellarmin's *rule, which is this,* That (*ſaith he*) is a true Tradition which all former Doctors have ſucceſſively in their ſeveral Ages acknowledged to come from the Apoſtles, and by their Doctrine or Practices have approved, and which the Univerſal

verſal Church owneth as ſuch; and the reaſon is, becauſe the Univerſal Church cannot err *.

Prot. I ſee all depends upon this Foundation, that the Catholic Church (in your ſenſe) cannot err; which, having diſproved, I need not trouble my ſelf further: to wave that, How I pray you do you know what former Doctors have ſucceſſively owned by word or practice? I preſume none of your Popes have ſo good a memory as to remember all that hath been ſaid or done in former ages, tho in my opinion when your inventions were upon the Wheel, and you did confer upon the Pope an infallible Judgment, you ſhould have given him alſo an allſufficient memory, and then you had done your work.

Pop. *No Sir, we pretend no ſuch thing: but we know this from the writings which the Doctors have left. It is true,* Bellarmine *mentions another rule, which is* the continual uſage of the Church in all ages; *but to deal candidly with you) I cannot know what their uſe was, but by their writings; ſo all muſt come to that.*

Prot. Firſt, then I note, you forſake your cauſe, and it ſeems a writing is now made a rule for your unwritten Traditions; if it may be ſo, let me beg your favourable opinion of the Apoſtles writings; Beſides, thoſe Writers which record theſe Traditions, were they infallible?

Pop *No, we do not hold any particular writers*

---

* *De Tradit.* cap. 9.

Infallible,

Infallible, eſpecially not in matters of Fact, ſuch as reporting a Tradition or uſe of the Church, undoubtedly is.

Prot. Then they might miſtake falſe Traditions for true: Beſides, how can I tell what the Ancient Doctors did agree in, ſince moſt of them never wrote; and many of their writings are loſt; and yet all of them had equal liberty of voting in this caſe? beſides, I have heard that divers of the Ancient Fathers did report ſeveral things to be Apoſtolical Traditions which your Church now rejecteth, as *that Infants ſhould receive the Communion, and that Chriſt ſhould reign on earth a thouſand years*, and many others: I am told alſo, that your great *Baronius*, writing concerning the Apoſtles, profeſſeth, *He deſpairs to find out the truth, even in thoſe matters which true writers have recorded; becauſe there was nothing which remained ſincere and uncorrupted.* Is it ſo?

Pop. *You ſhall find me ingenuous; it is ſo:* Baronius *ſaith it, Anno* 44. *Sect.* 42.

Prot. Then truly I ſhall bid tradition (in your ſenſe) good night: For as to your Traditions, I ſee there is no certainty in them. *Shall I forſake the certain and acknowledg'd verity of the Scripture, for ſuch traſh?* God forbid.

Again, I pray you tell me, doth not every wiſe man that makes any thing, make it ſufficient for its end? If you build an houſe to live in, will you not make it ſufficient for that end? If a man makes a ſword to cut with, a Coat of Male to defend him, *&c.* is he not a Fool if he doth not, if he can, make them ſufficient for their end and uſe?

Pop.

Pop. *That muſt needs be granted.*

Prot. And was not our Inſtruction and Salvation the end for which God wrote the Scripture?

Pop. *How do you prove that it was?*

Prot. God himſelf tells me ſo, *John* 20. 31. *Theſe things are written, that you may believe that Jeſus is the Chriſt, the Son of God, and that believing you might have life through his Name.*

Pop. St. John *ſpeaks there of miracles, not of Doctrines, and ſo that is nothing to the purpoſe.*

Prot. He ſpeaks of Miracles, which were done in confirmation of the Doctrine of Chriſt, and ſo the Doctrine is not to be excluded: beſides, I ſuppoſe you will not ſay that St. *John* wrote the Doctrines of Chriſt for one end, and the Miracles for another: Moreover, it plainly appears, both that this was the end for which the Scripture was written, and that is ſufficient for its end, from that 2 *Tim.* 3. 15, 16, 17. he ſaith expreſly, *The Scriptures are able to make a man of God wiſe unto ſalvation* *.

Pop. *Well, but if all theſe things be ſo, yet ſince the Scripture is dark and doubtful, and you can never apprehend the true meaning of it but from the Church, you are never the nearer, and the Scripture is not a convenient judg of controverſies.*

Prot. Tell me, I pray, doth your Church underſtand the true meaning of the Scripture?

Pop. *Yes doubtleſs, becauſe ſhe hath the Spirit of God.*

Prot. Then certainly ſhe is moſt deeply

* Of which ſee *Nullity*, Append. p. 92.

guilty

guilty of uncharitableneſs, or envy, or cruelty to Souls, that ſhe doth not put forth a clear and infallible Comment upon the whole Scripture; but ſtill ſuffers the whole world to live in contention about the true meaning of hundreds of Texts of Scripture.

Pop. She forbears that, for reaſons beſt known to her ſelf. But this is not much to the purpoſe.

Prot. Whereas you pretend your Church certainly knows the true ſenſe of the Scripture, and this Church you ſay is the Pope, or a Council; and if theſe be infallible, you ſay they are ſo in their Decrees: If this be ſo, how comes it to paſs that none do more groſly miſtake, and miſ-apply Scripture, than divers of your Popes and Councils have done, even in their Decrees, and decretal Epiſtles (which you reverence as the Goſpel)? Your Pope *Nicolas* the Firſt, proves the Supremacy from that Text, *Ariſe* Peter, *kill and eat*; Small encouragment to us to become his ſheep, if he ſo uſe them; and from hence, that *Peter drew to the ſhore his Net full of Fiſhes*: your Pope *Boniface* the Eighth proves it from *Gen.* 1. 1. *In the beginning God created Heaven & Earth*; therefore 'the Pope hath power in Temporals & Spirituals; 'and this (*ſaith he*) you muſt hold, unleſs with the 'Manachees you hold two principles. And your Councils are not more happy Expoſitors. The Council of *Lateran* proves the Popes power from *Pſal.* 72 (which ſpeaks of *Solomon* and Chriſt) *All Kings ſhall fall down before him.* The ſecond Council of *Nice* alledges theſe Scriptures for the Worſhip of Images, that *God created man in his own Image*, Gen. 1. *Let me ſee thy*

 countenance,

countenance, Cant. 2. *No man when he hath lighted a Candle covereth it under a veſſel,* Luk. 8. 19. In my opinion they ſpoke like a Council, expecting that the world ſhould receive their Decrees, not for any ſolidity of Argument (that had been pedantick) but merely for the Churches Majeſty and Authority; nay, the Jeſt is, when their Adverſaries had taken notice of theſe abſurd impertinencies, up ſteps *Pater Noſter*, Pope *Adrian*, and he ſaith, he will maintain it (in ſpite of fate) that they alledged them rightly and excellently: So here we have a Pope and Councill joyning together (and therefore undoubtedly infallible) in theſe Expoſitions. Nay, the Council of *Trent* it ſelf (when one would expect they ſhould have grown wiſer, though not better) prove the unequal power of Popes, Biſhops, and Prieſts, from. 13. 1 *The powers that be, are ordained of God; that is, digeſted into order.* I hope ere you have done, you will put forth an intire Comment upon the whole Bible, which I aſſure you will be the rareſt Book that ever ſaw the light. But further, I deſire to know of you how your Church comes to have this true and certain ſenſe of Scripture? hath ſhe it by Revelation, or Inſpiration?

Pop. *No, we pretend to no ſuch things; but ſhe comes to know it by the diligent uſe of means, by prayer, by reading, and comparing Scripture, by conſulting ancient Interpreters, Analogy of Faith, the coherence, &c. and even the Pope himſelf, when he ſet forth his Tranſlation of the Bible, He profeſſes to all the world, that he did it in the very ſame manner, and by the ſame helps, that other Tranſla-*

tors

tors do; that is, by adviſing with learned men, and conſulting ancient Copies, and the like *.

---

* Sixtus *the* Fifth, *Pope, tells us in his Preface to his Tranſlation of the Bible, that* He pickt out of the Cardinals, and almoſt out of all Nations, a Colledg of moſt Learned Men, who adviſed him in that work; They (*ſaith he*) conſulted, and I choſe that which was beſt. *And he adds theſe remarkable words,* It is moſt evident, that there is no ſurer, nor ſtronger Argument, than the comparing of antient and approved Copies. *And (he tells us) that* he carefully corrected it with his own hands. *And then the Pope impoſeth this Tranſlation upon all the world,* to be followed without adding, or diminiſhing, or altering, under pain of Excommunication. *And yet (that you may ſee how they abuſe the peoples credulity to make them believe the Popes Infallibility, which themſelves do not in earneſt believe:) About two years after, comes* Clement *the Eighth and he puts forth another Edition and Tranſlation of the Bible, differing from, and contrary to the former Edition, in two Thouſand places, as Doctor* James *hath proved, by producing the places, as they are in both Editions. And, which is more than all this, in the preface to the laſt Bible of* Clement *the eighth, we have theſe words*; Receive, Chriſtian Reader this old and vulgar Edition of the Scripture, corrected with all poſſible diligence, which though

* In his *Bellum Papale*, and defence of it.

though in reſpect of humane weakneſs, it be hard to affirm, that it is every way compleat; yet it is not to be doubted but it is more pure and corrected than all that hath gone before it. *I think this were ſufficien evidence (if there were no other) how great a cheat it is, that you pretend the Pope to be the Infallible interprete of Scripture. For there we have one of thoſe Infallibles directly contradicting and over-turning the other: and beſides, inſtead of that Divine (or, after a ſort Divine) Infallibility which you aſcribe to the Pope, we have here a publick acknowledgment of his imbecility; nor dare he affirm his work to be perfect, which it muſt needs have been, if he had been infallibly guided in it (as you pretend he was) nor would he have ſaid ſo, if he had believed his own Infallibility.*

Prot. Very good; Then I pray you tell me why a Proteſtant Miniſter (being oft times both a learneder and better man than the Pope) may not as certainly hit upon the true ſenſe of the Scripture, as the Pope himſelf?

Pop. *The reaſon is plain, becauſe the Pope is guided by the Infallible aſſiſtance of Gods Spirit.*

Prot. You ought not to rant at this height, until you have ſolidly anſwered what our Divines have wrote againſt this Infallibility. And I heard before, the woful weakneſs of your Arguments; for it is to me the vaineſt thing in the World to pretend a promiſe of the Spirit of God Infallibly to guide ſuch men as (if the Scripture be true) have not the Spirit of Chriſt

Chriſt in them, being (as you confeſs many of your Popes and Biſhops were) *ſenſual, not having the Spirit*; and having apparently no other ſpirit in them, but the ſpirit of the World, the Spirit that luſteth to envy, and all wickedneſs; but ſince you pretend the Scripture is ſo dark, I pray you tell me, What was the end for which God deſigned the Scripture? Sure I think it was for our underſtanding; my Bible tells me, that *whatſoever things were written before time, were written for our learning*, Rom. 15. 4. But if you ſay true, it ſeems God means only to put forth riddles; Gods Law was deſigned by him for *a light, and that even to the ſimple*, Pſal 19 7, 8, 9. and 119. 105. And in a word, the Goſpel is ſo clear, that Saint *Paul* pronounceth, *it is hid from none but them that periſh*, 2 Cor. 4. 3, 4. And Saint *Luke* wrote his Goſpel, that *Theophilus* (and with him other Chriſtians) *might know the certainty of thoſe things wherein they had been inſtructed*, Luk. 1. 4. and generally every diſcreet man that writes a Book, writes it ſo, as it may be underſtood; eſpecially if it be for the benefit of the Ignorant, as well as the learned (which the Scripture aſſuredly was). Tell me then, I pray you, why ſhould God write his mind ſo darkly and doubtfully as you know whoſe Oracles are ſaid to be delivered? was it becauſe God could not write plainer (and wanted the gift of utterance), or becauſe he would not?

Pop. *Notwithſtanding all this, it is certain, the Scripture is full of obſcure places.*

Pro. I do not deny this; but thoſe things which are obſcurely delivered in one place,

are more clearly delivered in another; and thoſe dark places generally are about Propheſies, and ſuch other things, the knowledg of which is not neceſſary to ſalvation. But for neceſſaries, the Scripture is plain, and I am told that divers of your Authors acknowledg ſo much: Is this true?

Pop. *I confeſs* Coſterus *hath this expreſſion*, That things which are neceſſary to be known by all Chriſtians, are plainly and clearly delivered in the writings of the Apoſtles: *and ſome others of our doctors ſay as much* *.

Prot. It could be nothing but the evidence of the truth which forced ſuch an acknowledgment from its greateſt adverſaries; therefore let this go, and let me hear what further you have to ſay againſt our Religion.

Pop. *I find you are an obſtinate Heretick, and ſetled upon the lees, and therefore it will be needleſs to diſcourſe further with you; if any thing could have convinced you, ſurely the Arguments I have offered would have done it; for I aſſure you I have pickt out the ſtrength and marrow of the Catholick Cauſe, in the points we have diſcourſed. And ſince I ſee you turn a deaf ear to my counſel, I ſhall give you over as incorrigible.*

Prot. You ſee I have heard you with great patience, and given you all the freedom you could deſire; Now I have one requeſt to you, that you would allow me the ſame

---

* See *Nullity* of *Romiſh* Faith, *Chap.* 7. *Sect.* 4.

priviledg,

priviledg, with patience to hear, and if you can, anſwer what I ſhall object againſt your Religion.

Pop. *With a very good will, I'le meet you here to morrow at this time: ſo at preſent adieu.*

The SECOND CONFERENCE.

Proteſt. WELL met Sir, I ſee you are as good as your word, and I hope you will allow me as much freedom and patience as I did you.

Pop. *I ſhall willingly do it, therefore ſpeak freely, and ſo will I; and if Truth be on your ſide, let it prevail.*

Prot. I ſhall divide my diſcourſe into two parts.

1. Some general Conſiderations, which indeed do very much ſet me againſt your Religion.

2. I ſhall examine the grounds of your Principal Points of Doctrine; for to meddle with all, will be needleſs; If your Pillars fall, the reſt cannot ſtand. For the firſt, there are ſeveral weighty Conſiderations againſt your

Religion; I ſhall give you them in order. The firſt general Conſideration is this:

1. That your Church declines all Judgment but her own, and makes her ſelf Judg in her own Cauſe; you do not allow Scripture to be Judg, nor the Ancient Fathers (for all your talk of Antiquity) nor indeed any but your ſelves, the Pope, or a Council of your own; and your Church it ſeems muſt determine, whether ſhe be a true Church or no, and whether ſhe be pure or corrupt, or whether ſhe be Infallible or no. Is this ſo.

Pop. *I confeſs this is our Doctrine, and I think grounded upon Reaſon.*

Pro. You ſpeak againſt the common ſenſe of all men. In all Controverſies or differences between Men and Men, we generally ſuſpect that party, who will ſubmit to no Judgment but his own; and he who is willing to refer himſelf to any third indifferent party, is generally preſumed to have the beſt Cauſe; and this is our Caſe, Proteſtants do not make themſelves and their own Church the only Judg (tho they might as juſtly and reaſonably do it as you), but they are very willing to ſubmit to other Judges; they refer themſelvs to be judged by the Scripture, which is acknowledged to be a moſt indifferent Judg; If that do not pleaſe you, they refer themſelves to the Fathers for the firſt ſix Hundred years, till your abominations had leavened the world, according to what was foretold, *Rev.* 13 8.

2. My ſecond Conſideration is this; You do not only decline the Scriptures Judgment, but you infinitely diſparage and vilifie it. I

meet

meet with several passages quoted out of your Authors to that purpose.

Pop *Possibly you may out of some inconsiderable ones, but not out of any of note and name in our Church.*

Pro. Yes, out of your prime Authors. I read that Cardinal *Hosius* in his *Advertisement to King Sigismund*, hath this expression, *if they* (that is the Heretieks) *say; it is written, that is the voice of the Devil, speaking in his members* (*a*) But that it is below a Cardinal to read the Bible, he would have found the words also in Christs mouth. I read that *Costerus* calls the Scripture by way of contempt, *Paper and Parchment. God* (saith he) *would not have his Church* (by which always understand the Papists themselves) *now depend upon Paper and Parchment, as* Moses *made the carnal* Israelites And again, *That which is written in the heart of the Church doth by many degrees excel the Scriptures; First, because that was written by the finger of God, but this by the Apostles* (*b*), as if the writings of the Apostles were only a device of man. I read that Cardinal *Pool* writing to *Henry the* Eighth, saith thus, *What an absurd thing is this, that thou didst attribute more Authority to the Scripture than to the Church, since the Scripture hath no authority but for the decree of the Church* (*c*)? (he means the *Roman* Church). I see we are highly concerned to please your

(*a*) *De expresso Dei Verbo.* (*b*) *Enchiridon cap.* 1. (*c*) *De primatu Romanæ Ecclesiæ, fol.* 91.

Church, else we are like to have no Scriptures; I read that *Pighius* saith, *The Apostles did never intend to subject our Faith to their Writings, but rather their Writings to our Faith* (c). And afterward he saith, *The Scriptures are (as one said, not more pleasantly than truly) a Nose of wax, which suffers it self to be drawn hither or thither, as a man pleaseth* (d). I read that your *Bullinger* saith, *The Scripture is the Daughter, the Church the Mother, which gives being and sufficiency to her she begets.* (No wonder then, the Church makes bold with the Scripture, to add, or alter, or dispense with it. We all know the Mother may correct the Daughter). I confess, when I read those passages produced by our Writers, I suspected they wronged them. Are these things true?

Pop. *I acknowledg it; and it is a vain thing for me to deny it, for the Books and those passages in them, are extant under their own hands: And I must confess these Authors are as considerable and approved as any we have. But you ought to put a favourable sense upon them.*

Prot. I would not strain them, nor make them worse than they are. Take them as you will, they are abominable expressions, and (to me) a great evidence, that the Scripture is no friend to your Church. And I conclude this to be one accomplishment of what Christ hath said, *Every one that doth evil, hateth the Light, neither cometh to the Light, lest his deeds*

(c). *Eccles. Hierarch Lib.* 2. *Cap.* 2. (d). *Lib. l.* 3. *c.* 3. *fol.* 103.

sha

shall be reproved, John 3. 20. And if this be the spirit by which your Church is guided, I am sure it is not the Spirit of God and of Truth; for that teacheth men reverence and love to the Scriptures: You seem to do like *Herod*, who being convinced that he was not of the Royal Race of the *Jews*, did burn their Genealogies and Records, that his false pretences might not be confuted by them. And just so do you endeavour to do by the Scriptures.

3. My third Consideration against your Religion is this; That your Cause is such as dares not abide Tryal; This is the Honour and happiness of our Religion; We are allowed to examine all that our Ministers say; and we have a Rule (which we may peruse) to try them by, *viz.* the Holy Scriptures, which you dare not suffer your people to read. And this I take to be a secret confession of your guilt; and I am told your *Alphonsus de Castro* saith, *That from the reading of the Scriptures all Heresies come* *.

Pop. *I think your experience hath justified that expression. You see what you get by the reading of the Scriptures, even this, that you are crumbled into a Thousand Sects.*

Prot. Our Saviour was not of your mind, for he thought not acquaintance with, but ignorance of the Scriptures was the cause of Error; *Ye err, not knowing the Scriptures*, Mat. 22. 29. Nor did he only allow, but command

---

* *Contra Hæreses, l.* 5. *c.* 6.

the

the *Jews* to *search the Scripture*, without any fear of this inconvenience, *John* 5. 39. Had St *Paul* been of your mind, he would not have commended, but reproved the *Bereans* for searching the Scriptures, and examining his Doctrine by them, *Act* 17. 11. If any of your people should do as the *Bereans* did, they would be sent to the Inquisition. I do not deny, but too many make a bad use of the Scriptnre, and wrest it to wicked purposes, which is to me no better an argument than this; Wine makes many men drunk, therefore no Wine must be sold. The Doctrine of free Grace was abused by thousands (as we read), therefore St. *Paul* did ill in preaching of it. The light of the Sun hurts sore eyes, therefore *Solomon* was mistaken, when he said, *It is a pleasant thing to behold the Sun.* But since you speak of this, I pray you let me ask you one question; Were not most of the Heresies that ever were in the Church, brought in by learned men?

Pop. *I cannot deny that, for it is notoriously known.*

Pro. Then you shut up the wrong Door; for it seems, it is not the unlearned mans reading, but the learned mans perverting the Scripture, which is the true Cause and Foundation of Heresies: And besides, you must not do evil, that good may come out of it; nor defraud people of their greatest treasure, nor keep them from their duty, for fear of some inconveniences. This is, to make your selves wiser than God.

Pop. *But indeed you slander us in this point;*

We

We do not abſolutely forbid reading of the Scriptures. The Council of Trent *allows it, provided you can get the Biſhops leave.*

Prot It is true, that Council pretends to give ſome ſuch liberty; but they take away with one hand, what they give with the other; for in their Index of forbidden Books, they have this paſſage: 'Since experience ſheweth, that 'the promiſcuous reading of the Bible brings 'more evil than good; therefore if any man ſhall 'dare to read, or have a Bible without a Licenſe 'from the Biſhop, or Inquiſitor, he ſhall not be 'capable of Abſolution *, unleſs he part with 'his Bible. But in truth, this pretended Licenſe is but an handſome blind; For in that very place there is this obſervation added to that Rule, 'That the power of giving ſuch Licenſes of 'reading, or keeping the vulgar Bibles, is taken 'away from ſuch Biſhops and Inquiſitors, by the 'command and uſage of the *Roman* and univer-'ſal Inquiſition. At beſt, it ſeems, I muſt not obey Chriſts command of *ſearching the Scripture*, unleſs the Biſhop give me leave. But I pray, you tell me, Do your people uſe to ask, and the Biſhops to give them leave to read the Bible?

Pop. *I will not diſſemble with you, They do not. And the truth is, an approved writer of ours,* Ledeſima, *puts the queſtion,* What if a man ſhould come to the Biſhop, and deſire liberty to read the Bible, and that with a good intention? *to which he replies, that* the Biſhop ſhould anſwer him in the words of Chriſt, *Mat.* 20.

* In fine *Concil Trident, Reg.* 4.

20, Ye know not what ye ask; and indeed (*ſaith he, and he ſaith it truly,*) the root of this demand is an heretical diſpoſition *.

Prot. Then I perceive in this, as well as in other things, you are more careful to deceive people with pretences, than to inform them. But indeed, you tell me no more than I had read or heard out of your own Authors. It was the ſpeech of your Pope *Innocent*, That *the Mountain which the Beaſt muſt not touch, is the high and holy Scriptures which the unlearned muſt not read* *: and your Doctors commonly affirm, that people muſt not be ſuffered to read the Scriptures, becauſe *we muſt not give holy things to Dogs, nor caſt pearls before Swine.*

My fourth general Conſideration againſt your Religion is this, That it groſly contradicts the great deſigns and ends of the Chriſtian Religion, which all confeſs to be ſuch as theſe, The glorifying of God, and his Son Jeſus Chriſt, and the humbling and abaſing of men, the beating down of all ſin, and the promoting of ſerious Holineſs. Are not theſe the chief ends of Religion?

Pop. *I do freely acknowledg they are, and our Religion doth moſt anſwer theſe ends.*

Prot. That you and I will now try. And for the firſt, Your Religion doth highly diſhonour God ſundry ways. What can be a greater diſhonour to God, than to make the holy Scriptures (that you confeſs to be the word of God) to depend upon the Teſtimony and

* *De Sacris vernaculis.*

Authority

Authority of your Pope, or Church, and to ſay that the word of God is but a dead Letter, and hath no Authority over us, without their Interpretation and Approbation; By which means Malefactors (for ſuch all men are, *Rom.* 3. 9, 10. your Pope not excepted) are made Judges of, and ſuperiour to that Law whereby they are condemned? Tell me, Would not the *French* King take it for a great diſhonour, if any of his Subjects ſhould ſay, That his Edicts and Decrees had no Authority over his people without their approbation?

Pop. *Yes, doubtleſs he would.*

Prot. Juſt ſo you deal with God: and what can be a fouler diſhonour to God, than that which your great *Stapleton* affirmed, and *Gretſer* and others juſtified, and your Church to this day have never diſowned it, *That the Divinity of Chriſt and of God,* (in reſpect of us) *depends upon the Authority of the Pope* *? And what more diſhonourable to God than what your great Champion *Bellarmine* ſaith, That *if the Pope ſhould err in forbidding Virtues* (which God hath Commanded) *and commanding Vices* (which God hath forbidden); (And that he may ſo err, divers of your moſt famous and approved Authors confeſs *) *the Church were bound to believe Vices to be good, and Virtues bad, unleſs ſhe would ſin againſt Conſcience*‡, that is in plain terms, the Pope is to be obeyed before God. Again, is it not highly diſhonourable to God to give the worſhip which is proper to God,

* *Triplicatio contra*, Whitak. c. 17.
* See *Nullity*, ‡ *De Pont.* l. 4. c. 5.

unto

unto the Creature? I confeſs the propher *Iſaiah* hath convinced me of it, *Iſa.* 42. 8. 'I am the 'Lord, that is my name, and my glory will I 'not give to another, neither my praiſe to graven 'Images.

Pop. I alſo am of the ſame mind; but it is a ſcandal of your miniſters, to ſay we give Gods honour to the Creature; I know where-about you are, you mean it of Images; whereas we worſhip them with a lower kind of worſhip.

Prot. You worſhip them with ſuch a kind of worſhip, as neither Angels nor Saints durſt receive: *Cornelius* did not worſhip *Peter* with a Divine Worſhip as God (for he knew he was but Gods Miniſter); yet *Peter* durſt not receive it. It was an inferior Worſhip which the Devil required of Chriſt, for he acknowledges at the ſame time, God to be his Superiour, and the giver of that power he claimeth, *Luk.* 4. 6. and yet that was the worſhip which Chriſt ſaith God hath forbidden to be given to any Creature. You are a valiant *man*, that dare venture your immortal ſoul upon a nice School-diſtinction. I pray you, do you not worſhip the Bread in the Sacrament with that worſhip which you call *Latria*, which is proper to God?

Pop. *We do ſo, and that upon very good reaſon, becauſe it is not Bread but the very body of Chriſt into which the Bread is turned.*

Prot. But what if the Bread be not converted into Chriſt's Body? Is it not then an high diſhonour to God, and indeed damnable Idolatry?

Pop. *Yes, our* Fiſher, *the famous Martyr and*

Biſhop

Biſhop of Rocheſter, *ſaith*, No man can doubt, if there be nothing in the Euchariſt but Bread, that the whole Church hath been guilty of Idolatry for a long time, and therefore muſt needs be damned *: *But we are well aſſured that it is no longer bread: and yet I muſt add this; if peradventure it ſhould ſtill remain Bread, yet for as much as we believe it to be the Body of our Lord, our ignorance, I hope, would excuſe us from Idolatry, and God would not impute it to us.*

Pro. Tell me, I beſeech you, Will all kind of ignorance excuſe a man?

Pop. *No certainly, There is a wilful and affected ignorance, which, becauſe it is againſt clear light, will not excuſe.*

Pro. Tell me further, Did this excuſe the *Jews* from their ſin of crucifying Chriſt, and the damnation due to it, that *they did it ignorantly?* Acts 3. 17.

Pop. *No, becauſe they ſhut their eyes againſt the plain light, and clear evidence of that truth, that Chriſt was the Meſſiah.*

Pro. No leſs do you in the Doctrine of the Sacrament; for they had no greater evidences againſt them, than Senſe, and Reaſon, and Scripture; all which you reject (as I ſhall prove by God's help). And as your Religion diſhonours God, ſo doth it alſo highly diſhonour Jeſus Chriſt whom he hath ſent, who is expreſly called the *one Mediator*, 1 *Tim.* 2. 5. But you have conferred that honour upon many others, Saints and Angels.

---

* *Ruffenſis contra Oecopadiam*, c. 2. ſol. 3.

Pop.

Pop. *True there is but one chief Mediator, but there may be other ſecondary Mediators.*

Prot. In like manner, to that which the Apoſtle there ſaith, *there is but one God*, it might be ſaid, there are other ſecondary gods, and ſo we might introduce the Heathen gods into the Church. It is the great prerogative of Jeſus Chriſt, that he is the Redeemer of the World; yet your *Bellarmine* was not afraid to communicate this honour to the creature, and expreſly ſaith, 'It is not abſurd, that holy men be 'called our Redeemers after a ſort; and more of the like ſtuff we ſhall meet with before we part; yet again, your Religion, as it depreſſeth God, ſo it exalts the creature; I will inſtance but in one thing, and that is your Doctrine of Juſtification by the merit of good works. A Doctrine, which St. *Paul* affirms, gives unto a man matter of boaſting and glorying, Rom. 3. 27, 'where is boaſting then? It is excluded; By 'what Law? of works? Nay, but by the Law of 'Faith: *and Rom.* 4. 2, For if *Abraham* were 'juſtified by works, he hath whereof to glory. Next, you grant, That is is the great deſign and intent of Religion, to diſcourage and beat down ſin, which your Religion doth exceedingly incourage by your Doctrines and Practice in Abſolutions and Indulgences. In my acquaintance, I have known ſeveral Papiſts that have wonderfully encouraged themſelves in their wicked ways from this conſideration; eſpecially when *Eaſter* drew near, becauſe they knew

---

* *De Indulgentis*, cap. 4 *ſub finem.*

they

they ſhould very ſuddenly be ſhriven, and abſolved, and be (as they ſaid) as ſound and clean as when they came firſt into the World: I have known alſo divers of our looſe Proteſtants that have turn'd to your Religion, that they might have greater liberty for, and the more ſecurity in ſin: and in my Conſcience, if I would let my luſts chuſe a Religion for me, they would preſently lead me to your Religion: And ſo again, your Religion doth not at all promote ſerious Holineſs, but the Soul and Spirit of it is dwindled away into meer formality: What can be of more peſtilent conſequence to true holineſs, than to tell a man, that the ſaying ſo many *Pater-Noſters*, or *Ave-Maries* (though it may be he is talking, or gazing about in the midſt of his Devotions) will procure him acceptance with God? Is it true, that your great and devout Doctor *Suarez* ſaith, That *it is not eſſential to Prayer, that a man ſhould think of what he ſaith?*

Pop. *It is true, he doth ſay ſo in his Book of Prayer.*

Prot. Then I confeſs, your Religion hath the advantage of ours, for a man may do two buſineſſes at once; It hath ſet me much againſt your Religion, ſince I underſtood that you turned that great Doctrine of Repentance into a meer formality; What a ſad Doctrine is it that your great Maſters teach, That Repentance is not neceſſary at all times, but only on Holy-days (as ſome of your Authors ſay); only once in a year, that is, at *Eaſter* (as others)? Nay indeed, once in all his life, and that in danger of death (as *Navar* and *Cajetan*)?

What

what an encouragement is this to wickedness, to tell men that a thousand of their sins are venial, which tho not repented of, will not exclude them from the favour of God, and from Salvation? but I will rake no farther into this kennel.

I think this may serve turn, to let you see, that I had warrant to say, That your Religion contradicts the design and end of all Religion.

4. The fifth Consideration that sets me against your Religion; is the desperate issues that you are driven to in the defence of your Cause; as for example, in the great point of Infallibility, I observe your learned Doctors are beaten out of all their former Assertions and Opinions; you have been driven from Scripture to the Fathers, from them to the Pope, from him to a Council, and thence to the Pope with a Council, and (as a further sign of a desperate cause) the Jesuits are brought to that exigence, that they are forced to affirm the Pope to be Infallible in matters of fact, which is confessedly a new, upstart, and indeed, monstrous Opinion; and yet those piercing wits see their Cause cannot be defended without it: and others seeing the vanity of all their former pretences, have been forced to resolve all into the present Churches testimony *. So for the point of Idolatry, you are driven to those straits, that you cannot excuse your selves from Idolatry, but by such pretences as will excuse both Jewish and Gen-

* *Greg de Valentia.*

tile

tile Idolaters; and one of your ableſt Champions is brought to this plunge, that he is forced to affirm, that *ſome Idolatry is lawful* *. I might inſtance in very many others, but I forbear.

6. A ſixth conſideration is taken from the partiality of your Religion; That Religion which is from God, is doubtleſs agreeable to the Nature and Will of God. But ſo is not your Religion, for it is guilty of that reſpect of perſons which Scripture every where denies to be in God, *Acts* 10 34. *Rom.* 2. 11. *Job* 34. 19.

Pop. *How is our Religion guilty of reſpect of perſons?*

Prot. I might ſhew it in many things, but I will confine my ſelf to one particular; and that is, in point of Indulgences. The Souls of all that dye in venial ſins, are doomed to thoſe terrible pains of Purgatory, there to continue none knows how long (by the way, I cannot but take notice of the great unhappineſs of thoſe Chriſtians, that lived and died in the days of Chriſt and the Apoſtles, that have been multitudes of them frying in Purgatory to this day, and are like to be ſo as long as the World laſts; whereas thoſe that live nearer the end of the World, muſt needs have a far ſhorter abode there; ſo men are puniſhed with continuance of their torments meerly for the circumſtance of time of their birth; but this is not the thing I aim at) from theſe

* *Greg. de Valentia.*

pains of Purgatory there is no way to deliver a man but by Indulgences; and theſe indulgences muſt be bought off with money, and wealthy men may buy off thoſe corporal pains (which the raſcal-herd muſt ſuffer without bail or main-priſe) and turn them into a fine of the purſe. So I ſee it was not without reaſon that *Solomon* ſaid, *Money anſwers all things.* I have heard that your tax of the Apoſtolical Chancery (put forth by the Authority of your Church, where there is a price put upon all Indulgences, and upon all kind of ſins) hath this expreſſion, 'Diligently note, that theſe graces '(*of Indulgences*) are not given to the poor; be-'cauſe they are not, and therefore cannot be com-'forted (*a*); by which I ſee, that if St. *Peter* himſelf ſhould riſe from the dead, and come to his Succeſſor, with his old tone, *Silver and Gold have I none*; if he were a thouſand *Peters*, he muſt into Purgatory without mercy. I am told that another of your Authors, *Auguſtinus de ancona* an Author of great note with you, tells us, 'that Indulgences are for the relief of the 'Churches (*that is, the Popes and their Prelates*) 'Indigencies, which (*b*) is not relieved by

(a) *Diligenter nota quod hujuſmodo gratiæ non dantur pauperibus*, quia non ſunt; *ideo non poſſunt conſolari. Taxa Cancellariæ Apoſtolicæ.* Tit. De Matrimoniali.

(b) *Nam indulgentiæ fiunt ad relevandam indigentiam Eccleſiæ, quæ non relevatur per ſolam voluntatem dandi, ſed per datum.* De Poteſtate Papæ, queſt. 30 art. 3.

a wiling-

'a willingneſs to give (which is all that any poor 'man can pretend to) but by the gift it ſelf. (It ſeems your Church is not of Gods mind; for if *there be a willing mind, he accepteth it for the deed,* 2 Cor. 8. 12.) And a little after (as I am told) he ſaith, 'as to the remiſſion of puniſhment 'which is procured by Indulgences, in that caſe it 'is not inconvenient, that the rich is in a better 'condition than the poor, for there it is not ſaid, 'Come and buy without money (c). I confeſs that were a dangerous ſpeech, and would utterly undo all the Church of *Rome.* It is ſufficient that *Iſaiah* once ſaid it, and Chriſt again, *come and drink freely.* People ſhould have been wiſe, and taken them at the word, for they are never like to hear it a third time. Is this true?

Pop. *They do indeed ſay ſo; and the practice of our Church manifeſts to all the world, that Indulgences are ſold for money; and the condition of the rich, in that, is better than the poor. But what great matter is that, as to the pardon of ſin, and eternal life or death, both rich and poor are alike? This difference is only as to the pains of Purgatory.*

Prot. Is that nothing to you? you ſpeak againſt your own, and all mens ſenſe; we ſee how highly men eſteem to be freed from a painful, though ſhort diſeaſe here; how much

(c) *Quantum ad remiſſionem pœnæ quæ acquiritur per indulgentiam, in tali cauſa non eſt inconveniens, quod dives ſit melioris conditionis quàm pauper. Ibi enim non dicitur, Venite & emite ſine pecuniâ.* Ibid.

more

more to be freed from ſuch pains as you all confeſs to be unſpeakably more ſharp and grievous, than all the pains that ever were endured in this World: It is ſo conſiderable a thing, that I aſſure you, it is to me matter of wonder (if Chriſt and the Apoſtles had been of your mind) how it came to paſs ſo unluckily, that the poor only ſhould receive the Goſpel; whereas, if the men of that Age had not been all Fools, the rich would have been moſt forward to entertain it.

7. But to proceed. My ſeventh Conſideration againſt your Religion, is taken from its great hazard, and utter uncertainty. According to the Doctrine of your Church, no man can be ſure of his Salvation without a Revelation; but he muſt go out of the World, not knowing whither he goes. Indeed there is nothing but hazard and uncertainty in your Religion. I ſuppoſe you grant that all your Faith, and conſequently your Salvation, depends upon the infallible Authority of your Church.

Pop. *That is moſt certain.*

Pro. Are you then infallibly Certain, that your Chnrch is infallible? or do you only probably believe it?

Pop. *I am but a private prieſt, and therefore cannot pretend to Infallibility; but I am fully ſatisfied in it, that the Church is infallible in itſelf.*

Pro. Then I ſee you pretend to no more certainry than I have; for I know (and you grant) that the Scripture is infallible in itſelf; and I know its infallibility as certainly as you know the infallibility of your Church. But I pray you tell me, what is your opinion? I know

know you are divided: but where do you place the Infallibility, or where do you lay the foundation of your Faith?

Pop. *To deal freely with you, I place it in the Pope; who when he determines things* out of his Chair, *is infallible; for St.* Peter *who was Supream Head of the Church, left the Pope his Succeſſor.*

Pro. Then it ſeems your Faith doth wholly depend on theſe things, that St. *Peter* was Biſhop of *Rome*, and died there: and that he left the Pope his Succeſſor in his ſupream and infallible Authority.

Pop. *It doth ſo.*

Pro. How then are you infallibly aſſured of the truth of theſe things, which are all matters of Fact?

Pop. *Becauſe they are affirmed by ſo many of the ancient Fathers and Writers.*

Pro. Were thoſe Fathers or Writers infallible perſons?

Pop. *No.*

Pro Then might they, and ſo may you be miſtaken in that point; and ſo indeed you have nothing but a meer conjecture for the foundation of your Faith. But again, are you infallibly ſure, that Saint *Peter's* intention was to leave his Infallibility to the Pope? For I do not read that St. *Peter* left it in his laſt Will. I tell you true, it is ſtrange to me, that St. *Peter* ſhould write two Catholick Epiſtles, and (as I obſerved before) not leave one word concerning this matter. For my part I ſhall always rather queſtion the Popes Authority, than St. *Peter's* fidelity or diſcretion, in omit-

ting ſo Fundamental a point, when he put in many of far leſs concernment. But further I demand, How are you aſſured that St. *Peter* intended to leave his power, and did effectually leave it to his Succeſſors?

Pop. *By the unanimous conſent of the Ancient Fathers.*

Pro. I wonder at your confidence, that you dare affirm a thing which our Authors * have ſo clearly proved to be falſe. But ſuppoſe it were ſo, that the Fathers had ſaid it; tell me, are the Fathers infallible? at leaſt are they ſo in their *reports* of matter of Fact?

Pop. *No: we confeſs that it is only the Pope or Council that are infallible, not the Fathers; and to be true to you, even the Pope himſelf is not infallible in his reports of matters of fact.*

Pro. Then you have nothing but a meer conjecture, or hiſtorical Report delivered by men liable to miſtake, for the great foundation of your Faith. Yet once more, have you any greater or better certainty for your Faith than the Pope himſelf?

Pop. *God forbid I ſhould be ſo impudent or wicked to ſay ſo; for my Faith depends upon his certainty.*

Pro. Very well. How I beſeech you is the Pope aſſured? what is it that makes him infallibly certain of his own Infallibility? Is he aſſured of it by Revelation?

Pop. *No, (as I have told you oft) we pretend to no ſuch thing.*

Pro. How then?

---

* *Moulin, Reinolds* againſt *Hart*, and others.

Pop *By the Spirit of God which guides him into all truth.*

Pro. How is he assured that the Spirit of God guides him?

Pop. *By the promises God hath made to him; I need not repeat them, they are known already,* Thou art Peter, *&c* Simon, Simon, I have prayed that thy Faith fail not, *&c.*

Pro. I have already shewn how absurdly these Texts are alledged. But I beseech you, how is the Pope infallibly assured, that this is the true meaning of those Texts? You confess it is not by inspiration.

Pop. *He knows that, by considering and comparing Scripture, and by consulting the Fathers, by Prayer, Diligence and Obedience,* &c.

Pro. All these things are very good, but any other man may use these means as well as the Pope, and hath as full promises from God, as any the Pope pretends to; as *Joh.* 7. 17. *If any man will do his will, he shall know of the Doctrine, whether it be of God*; and the Spirit of Truth is promised to all that ask it: *Luk.* 11. 13. So if this be all you have to say, God deliver my Soul from such a desperate Religion, wherein all the certainty of its Faith depends upon his Infallibility that is not certain of his own Infallibility.

But I need say no more of this; It is to me an undeniable argument, that there is no certainty at all in this Foundation; because (as you confess) so many hundreds of your ablest Scholars do utterly reject it. But once more, in my opinion you run a dreadful hazard in the

Point of worſhipping of Creatures, Images, Saints, and eſpecially the Bread in the Sacrament, in which you run other hazards beſides thoſe I ſpoke of. I am told, that your Doctrine is this, That it is neceſſary to the making of a Sacrament (and ſo to the converſion of the Bread into Chriſt's Body) that the Prieſt intend to conſecrate it. Is it ſo?

Pop. *Yes, doubtleſs,* Bellarmine *and all our Authors largely diſpute for that.*

Pro And can I be ſure of another man's intentions? It is ſufficiently known, that divers of your Prieſts are prophane, and atheiſtical Wretches; others envious and malicious; and ſome actually Jews. What aſſurance have I, that my Prieſt is not ſuch an one, and that he doth not either out of a contempt or hatred of Religion, or Malice againſt my perſon, intend to deceive me, and not make a Sacrament of it? Sure I am they intend to deceive their people in the preaching of the World, and why they may not do ſo in the Adminiſtration of the Sacrament, I know not.

8. My eight and laſt general conſideration is this, That your Religion deſtroys even the Principles of morality: which true Religion is ſo far from deſtroying, that it improves and perfects it. I confeſs, the bloodineſs of your Religion hath ever made me both ſuſpect and loath it. I find that Chriſt is a Prince of peace; though he whipt ſome out of the Temple, yet he never whipt any into his Church; that he drew in his Diſciples with the Cords of a man, or conviction and perſwaſion; and ſo did his Apoſtles after him; but your Religion (like

Draco's

Draco's laws) is written in blood. I preceive you anſwer our Arguments with Fire and Faggot; beſides this, your Religion deſtroys all civil Faith and Society; your principle is known, and ſo is your practice of equivocation, and keeping no faith with Hereticks.

Pop. *I know where you are, you mean becauſe of* John Huſſe, *who after he had the faith of the Emperour given him for his ſafe Conduct, was contrary to that faith put to death in the Council of* Conſtance.

Pro. I do ſo, and what can you ſay for it?

Pop. *Thus I ſay, you muſt not charge upon our Church, the opinion of ſome few private Doctors, ſince others diſown this, and have written againſt it.*

Pro. It ſeems it is a diſputable point amongſt you, whether you ought to be honeſt or not; but I have heard that *John Huſſe* was condemned by the Council of *Conſtance* and that when the Emperour ſcrupled to break his Faith, they declared he might do it, and ought to do it. Is it ſo?

Pop. *It is true, what what was done in that point was done by the Council.*

Pro. And you hold Councils (eſpecially where the Pope joyns with them as he did with that Council) to be infallible; and therefore this I may confidently charge upon you as a principle of your Religion; I cannot but obſerve your fine devices: At other times when we alledg paſſages out of any of your learned Doctors which make againſt you, you tell us they are but private Doctors, and we muſt

judg of you by your Councils. Now here we bring an approved Councils teſtimony, and you ſend us back to your private Doctors.

Pop. *Theſe diſcourſes of yours are only general; I had rather you would come to the other thing you propoſed,* viz. *to examine the particular points of our Religion, wherein I hope I ſhall give you ſuch ſolid grounds and reaſons, that when you ſhall underſtand them, you will embrace them.*

Pro. You ſhall find me ingenuous and docible; only remember, I expect not words, but ſolid Arguments. I think our beſt courſe will be to pick out ſome Principal Points of your Religion, and examine them; for the reſt will either ſtand or fall as they do.

Pop. *I am perfectly of your mind, let us proceed accordingly.*

Pro. Firſt then, if you pleaſe, we will begin with the Sacrifice of the Maſs, which you ſay is eſſential to the Chriſtian Religion.

Pop. *It is ſo, and* Bellarmine *rightly ſaith, that* where there is no Sacrifice *(as you Proteſtants have none)* there is in truth no Religion.

Pro. Therefore, I pray you, let me hear one or two *(* for thoſe are as good as a hundred *)* of your chief grounds and reaſons for the Sacrifice.

Pop. *I approve your motion, and I ſhall only inſiſt upon two Arguments; Firſt, the Sacrifice of the Maſs was appointed by God, or Chriſt, in the words of Inſtitution of the Sacrament,* Do this in remembrance of me. *It is the great Argument of the Council of* Trent *.

* *Seſſ.* 22. *cap.* 9. *Can.* 2, 3.

Prot.

Pro. I adore the fruitfulneſs of your Churches invention. It ſeems they think theſe two words, *Do this*, contain no leſs than two of your Sacraments, to wit, that of *Orders*, which makes Prieſts, and that of the *Supper*.

Pop. *They do ſo.*

Prot. That, no ſober man will eaſily believe; nor that Chriſt's meaning in the words mentioned was this *Sacrifice me in remembrance of me.* But let me hear how you prove the Inſtitution of the Maſs from theſe words.

Pop. *Chriſt bid his Diſciples*, do this, *viz that which he did: Chriſt did in that laſt Supper truly and properly offer up himſelf to his Father, his body under the ſhape of Bread, his Blood under the ſhape of Wine; and therefore they were truly and properly to offer up or Sacrifice Chriſt in the Sacrament. The Argument is* Bellarmine's *.

Pro. How do you prove that Chriſt did in that laſt Supper truly and properly offer up his Body and Blood to his Father? I read that Chriſt offered himſelf but once *Heb.* 8 27 and 9. 25,26,27,28. and 10. 14. and that was upon the Croſs; nor do I find that he offered any thing at al to God in that Supper, but only to his Apoſtles. And what did Chriſt Sacrifice himſelf and imbrue his hands in his own Blood? and did he eat up his own Body? did he take his whole Body into his Mouth? theſe are Monſters of Opinions: But how prove you that Chriſt did then offer up himſelf to God?

Pop. *Becauſe Chriſt ſpeaks in the preſent tenſe*, This is my Body which is broken, Blood

* *De Miſſa. l.* 6. *c.* 12. *Sexum.*

which is shed; *he doth not say which* shall be *broken, and shed; and therefore it must be broken and shed at that very time.*

Pro. What a vain Argument is this? you know nothing is more usual in Scripture than to put the present Tense for the Future. Christ saith, 'I do lay down my life, when he means, I will do it shortly, *Joh.* 10. 15. 'I do go to my Father, *Joh.* 16. 28. that is, I shall go shortly. 'Do 'that thou dost, that is, art about to do, *Joh.* 13 27. And in *Mat.* 26. Christ saith of his Blood, 'This is my Blood which is shed for many for 'the remission of sins; and yet I suppose it was not shed at that time, for you all profess the Sacrifice of the Mass is an unbloody Sacrifice; But again, tell me, I pray you, when Christ said, *do this*, did they not obey Christ's command at that Supper?

Pop. *I cannot deny that.*

Pro. Thence unavoidably follows, that this *doing* concerns the Communicants, as well as (if not more than) the Ministers; and so it is not meant of Sacrificing Christ, but receiving of him; and really, if this Text do not, there is no other which doth enjoyn communicants to receive; which he that can believe, hath got a good mastery over his Faith. Besides, what Christ here commands his Apostles, I find St. *Paul* commands the *Corinthians*, and expounds *doing this*, by *eating and drinking* 1 Cor. 11. And moreover, if the words *do this*, were the words which did ordain both *Priest* and *Sacrifice*, who can think that two of the Evangelists, *viz.* Both *Matthew* and *Mark* would ave omitted them in mentioning the words

of

of Inſtitution; and therefore this may paſs. I ſhall only add, that if our Divines ſhould prove their Doctrines no better than by ſuch wreſted Scriptures and Arguments as this, we ſhould hiſs them out of the Pulpit; but I ſuppoſe you have ſome better Argument, therefore let me hear it.

Pop. *Conſider then that irreſiſtable Argument.* Chriſt is a Prieſt after the order of *Melchiſedeck*, *Now* Melchiſedeck *did offer up a Sacrifice of Bread and Wine to God*, Gen. 14. *and therefore Chriſt was bound in agreement with this Type, to offer up ſuch a Sacrifice even his Body and Blood under the ſpecies of Bread and Wine.*

Pro. You tell me, *Melchiſedeck* offered up Bread and Wine to God; I find no ſuch matter; it is only a dream of your own. The Hiſtory is, *Gen.* 14. where indeed I read of his offering Bread and Wine to *Abraham* and his Soldiers, to refreſh them (acording to the cuſtom of thoſe times and places), *Deut* 23. 3, 4. and *Judg.* 8. 6. but not a word of any offering to God. It is the ſtrangeſt relation of a Sacrifice that ever was; here's not one word of the *Altar or offering*, *or Conſecration*, or the *deſtruction* of the Sacrifice. You grant the thing ſacrificed muſt be deſtroyed when it is ſacrificed; I pray you how is this bread deſtroy'd (ſave only by the Souldiers mouths which you ſay came after the Sacrifice)?

Pop. *The bread poſſibly was deſtroyed by putting it in the furnace, and the Wine ſprinkled upon the furnace*, as Vaſquz *anſwers**.

---

* *In part* 3. *Thomæ tom.* 3. *q.* 83 *diſ.* 200. *ar.* 1. *c.* 5.

Pro. I see it was otherwise in those days than now it is. If I thought my Bread would be destroyed by putting it into the Oven, I assure you I would never put it in

Pop. *It must be a Sacrifice that is there related; for it follows,* And he was the Priest of the most High God

Pro. Not at all; for his being Priest evidently relates to that which follows, *and he blessed him and received Tithes of all.* Besides if *Melchisedeck* did here offer a Sacrifice, was Jesus Christ obliged to offer the same kind of Sacrifice that he did? for Christ was to offer up himself, *Heb.* 9. 10 (which none of his Types did) Tell me first, was *Melchisedeck* a Type of Christ in that action of eating Bread and Wine?

Pop. *Yes doubtless and this was the principal thing; in respect of which, Christ is called a Priest after the order of* Melchisedeck, *or else I say nothing.*

Pro Then tell me, how can any man in his wits, believe that St. *Paul,* who spends so much of his Epistle to the *Hebrews,* in comparing *Christ* and *Melchisedeck,* and their Priesthood together; and who picks up the very smallest circumstances, as that he was *without Father,* &c should not speak one word of this, (which if you say true) was the principal thing? Besides all this, If *Melchisedeck* was a Type of Christ in that action, did Christ offer Bread and Wine as *Melchisedeck* did?

Pop. *No, but he offered his own Body and Blood under the appearance of Bread and Wine.*

Pro. Nay, now I see there is no possibility

of

of pleaſing you; for I expected this all along, that Chriſt muſt needs have offered the ſame kind of Sacrifice that *Melchiſedeck* did here; But now you forſake your own argument; and becauſe *Melchiſedeck* did offer Bread and Wine, Chriſt muſt not offer Bread and Wine; but ſomething elſe under thoſe appearances. Now I have heard your two principal Arguments, I hope you will hear mine alſo.

Pop. *Good reaſon I ſhould do ſo.*

Pro. Then firſt, I argue thus: the Sacrifice of Chriſt was perfect, and did perfect all Believers, *Heb.* 10. 14. And therefore it need not and ought not to be repeated, for the Apoſtle proves the imperfection of Levitical Sacrifices, becauſe they were repeated; *Heb.* 10. 1, 2. *Where remiſſion for ſin is, there is no more offering for ſin, Heb.* 10. 18. Either then remiſſion was not obtained by his once offering, or there muſt be no more offering; either Chriſts offering upon the Croſs was ſufficient, or yours in the Maſs is unneceſſary.

Pop. *It is not properly repeated; for it is the ſame Sacrifice for ſubſtance which was offered upon the Croſs, and is offered in the Maſs* *.

Pro. How is it of the ſame kind, when you ſay, the one is bloody, the other unbloody; the one offered by Chriſt, the other by a Prieſt? but if it were of the ſame kind, ſo were the Levitical Sacrifices, and all had relation to Chriſt (as you pretend all Maſſes have), and yet the Apoſtle makes their Repetition an evidence of their Imperfection, *Heb* 9. 10. And moreover the Apoſtle denies not only the repetition of

* *Cornelius a Lapide in* Heb. 7 21.

other

other Sacrifices, but also of the same Sacrifice, and tells us as plainly (as man can speak) that Christ was to offer up himself but once, *Heb.* 9. 25, *&c.* whereas you will needs over-rule the Apostle, and force Christ to offer up himself thousands of times.

Pop. *It is true there is but one Sacrifice of Redemption, and Expiation for sin, and that was the Sacrifice of the Cross; but there are other Sacrifices of Application, to apply that to us*

Pro I hope the Word and Sacraments; and Spirit of Christ, are sufficient to apply Christs Sacrifice. Must we have one Sacrifice to apply another? Whoever heard of one Plaister made to apply another? Or a Ransome paid the second time to apply the former payment? And you seem to me quite to forget your selves, to destroy the nature of your Sacrifice; for the business of a Sacrifice is oblation to God, not application to Men. Besides, I have one Argument more which fully satisfies me; if the Mass be a real and proper Sacrifice, then the thing sacrificed may be really and properly destroyed.

Pop. *That I readily grant, as* Bellarmine* *also doth, and indeed so it was in all the Sacrifices that ever wer offered to God.*

Pro. But surely Jesus Christ is not destroyed in the Mass; is he? And are your Priests the murderers of Christ?

Pop. *He is not so destroyed; for we tell you, it is*

Sacri[illegible] verum & reali veram & realem occasio[illegible] igit. Bel de. Missa. l 2. c.27. Denique vel i[illegible]

An

an unbloody Sacrifice; yet he is in a manner destroy'd by the Priests eating of him; for thereby Christ ceaseth to be where he was before; that is in the species of Bread and Wine, and the Bread and Wine are destroyed.

Pro. Call you this a destruction for one to remove from one place to another, or to cease to be where he was before? this is ridiculous; and yet this (*b*) fantastical and mock-destruction is all which you can bring instead of that real destruction which you confess necessary to the very essence of the Sacrifice. And as for the Bread and Wine, they were destroyed by Transubstantiation, not by the Oblation or Sacrifice which comes after it.

And now having mentioned that, let us discourse concerning your Doctrine of Transubstantiation. And first, tell me what is the Doctrine of your Church?

Pop. That the Council of Trent will inform you; which declareth, That by Consecration the whole substance of the Bread and Wine is converted into the substance of the Body and Blood of Christ (*a*).

Pro. How is it possible for the Bread to be converted into Christs Body, which was made already before the Bread? That Christ could turn Water into Wine was possible, but that he should turn that Water into such Wine as was in being before that change, this is impossible; but let that go. My next question is, if a Christian did actually receive Christs Body and Blood, tell me what profit hath he by it?

(*b*) *Ibid.* (*a*) *Sess.* 13. *de Eucharist. cap.* 4.

I cannot

I cannot believe that God would work so many Miracles (as you affirm he doth in this Sacrament) to no purpose. Scripture and Reason tells me, and your Council of *Trent* confesseth (*a*), that the Sacrament is a feast for my Soul, and not for my Body Is it not so? now what is my Soul the better for eating the very Body of Christ? When the Woman cried out to our Saviour, (*b*) 'Blessed is the Womb that bare thee; '*Christ replies*, Yea rather, blessed are they that 'hear Gods Word and do it: nevertheless, if you can solidly prove it, I will receive it; therefore bring forth your principal Arguments for it.

Pop. *I will do so: and our Church proves this point, especially from two places of Scripture*, Jo.6. *and the words of institution. I begin with the sixth Chapter of* John, *where our Saviour oft tells us, that the* Bread which he gives is his flesh, *&c.*

Pro. I have heard that divers of your learned Doctors confess this Chapter speaks not of the Sacrament. Is it so?

Pop. *I will not dissemble with you, that was the opinion of* Biel (*c*) *Cardinal* Causanus (*d*), Cajetan (*e*) *and* Tapperus (*f*), *and divers others.*

Pro. Certainly this Argument is not likely to convince a Protestant, which could not satisfie your own ablest Scholars. But I will not press that farther. Tell me then, do you judg that Christ speaks here of a bodily eating and drinking of his very flesh and blood?

Pop. *We do so.*

(*a*) *Sess.* 13. *cap.* 2. (*b*) Luk. 11. 27 28. (*c*) *In Canoni Missæ* (*d*) *Ep.*7. *ad Bohemos.* (*e*) *In Aquin. par.* 3. *qu.* 80. *art.* 8. (*f*) *Artic. Lovan.* 15.

Pro.

Pro. I confeſs ſome of the Ancients were of your mind, I mean the *Jews*. But with ſubmiſſion, I am rather of Chriſts Opinion, who plainly deſtroys that groſs and carnal ſenſe, telling them, it is the *Spirit that quickneth, the fleſh profits nothing*, verſe 63. Again, doth not Chriſt preſs this as a neceſſary and preſent duty, upon all the *Jews* that then heard him?

Pop. *That muſt be granted.*

Pro Then certainly Chriſt ſpeaks not of the Sacrament which was not then inſtituted, and therefore they could not partake of it. I demand further, Is this Sacrament of ſuch efficacy, that all that receive it are ſaved? and of ſuch neceſſity, that all that do not take it are damned.

Pop. *No, our Church utterly condemns both thoſe Opinions.*

Pro. But this eating of Chriſts fleſh is ſuch, that Chriſt ſaith, all that eat it, are ſaved, *v.* 24. and all that do not eat it, are damned, *v.* 53. Therefore ſurely he ſpeaks not of a Sacramental eating: Beſides, the whole Laity are utterly undone, if your ſenſe of this Chapter be true; for I finde that drinking of Chriſts Blood is no leſs neceſſary to Life eternal, than eating of his fleſh; and therefore wo to them to whom you do not allow to drink of the Cup in the Sacrament. I am told this objection is ſo conſiderable, that it forced divers of your Doctors (ſore againſt their will) to forſake this Argument; and therefore this will not do your work: but I preſume you have better Arguments.

Pop.

Pop. *We have so; I should urge but one, which is of it's self sufficient, from the plain words of Institution,* This is my Body. *Methinks the very hearing of them read should convince you if you would take the words in their plain and proper sense, and not devise I know not what Figures and Tropes.*

Pro. If it were true, that Christ did turn the Bread into his Body by saying these words, *This is my body*, yet how doth it follow, that the Priest by reciting these words, worketh the same effect; any more than a Priest, every time he reads those words, *Let there be Light*, doth make Light, because God did make it by those words? or than he raiseth a dead man, every time he reads those words of Christ, *Lazarus come forth?* Moreover, I have heard, that divers of your most Learned Doctors confess, That this place doth not, nor indeed any other place of Scripture, prove Transubstantiation. I have heard three Cardinals named, *viz. Cajetan* (*a*) and our Bishop of *Rochester* (*b*) and *Gamera-censis* (*c*) and divers famous School-men, as *Scotus* and *Biel*, of whom this is known; and *Durandus* (*d*), and *Ocham* (*e*), and *Melchior Canus* (*f*) and *Vasquez* (*g*), and the great Cardinal *Perron* professeth, that *he believes Transubstantiation, not by vertue of any necessary consequence or reason, alledged by their Doctors; but by the words of Christ, as they are expounded by Tra-*

(*a*) *In* 3 *Thomæ qu.* 75. *art* 1. (*b*) *Contra Captiv. Bab. c.* 10. (*c*) *In* 4. *Sentent. qu.* 6. *lit f.* (*d*) *In* 4. *Distinc.* 11. *qu.* 4. *Art* 14. (*e*) *In* 4 *qu.* 6. (*f*) *Loc. com. l.* 3. *c.* 2. (*g*) *Tom.* 3. *in* 3. *dis.* 180. *c.* 5.

dition

dition (a); and *Bellarmine* himſelf confeſſeth, This opinion is not improbable *(b)*. Methinks ſo many learned mens forſaking this Argument (who doubtleſs would have been right glad if it had been ſolid, and imployed all their wits to ſearch out the ſtrength of it) is to me a convincing evidence of its weakneſs and vanity, as alſo the badneſs of your Cauſe, that can find no better Argument; yet I am willing to hear what you can ſay.

Pop. *This then I ſay, that theſe words,* This is my Body, *are to be taken in their proper, and not in a figurative ſenſe; for ſurely Chriſt would ſpeak plainly to the underſtanding of his Diſciples, eſpecially when he was ſo near his Death, and making his laſt Will and Teſtament, and inſtituting the Sacrament; in ſuch caſes men uſe to ſpeak plainly.*

Pro. I readily grant that Chriſt did ſpeak plainly and intelligibly. But tell me, is not that plain enough, when we take the words as they are commonly uſed in Scripture?

Pop. *I muſt needs grant that*; *but this is not the preſent caſe.*

Pro. But it is: for we can give you ſcores of inſtances, as you very well know, where the word *is*, is ſo taken: nor is any thing more frequent in Scripture, The ſeven kine, and ſo the ſeven ears of Corn, are ſeven years, Gen. 4. 12. 18. the Stars are the Angels of the Churches, Rev. 1. 20. the ſeven heads are ſeven Mountains, Rev. 19 So Chriſt ſaith, 'I am the way, the door, &c. So *Zech* 5. 7, 8. 'This woman *is* wickedneſs; and

(a) *Trairte p.* 793. (b) *De Euchar.* l. 3. c. 23.

thouſands

thousands of such expressions. How do you understand these places?

Pop. *The sense is plain, they* signifie *those things; the Stars* signifie *the Angels, and so for the rest.*

Pro. Then certainly we have the advantage of you in this point, for we take *is* for *signifies* (as you confess it is commonly taken); nor have the *Jews* (as I have been assured by learned men) any proper word for *signifie* (as the *Greeks* and *Latins* have) but generally express it in this manner: But you must take it (if the Particle *thus* denote the Bread, as I shall plainly prove it doth) for *is converted into*; a sense which you cannot give one example of in all Scripture. I see it was not without reason that you took the Interpretation of Scripture into the Churches hands, for if you had left it in Gods hands, and left one Scripture to do that friendly office to expound another, you had certainly lost an Article of your Faith; And whereas you say that Christ would speak so as the Disciples might understand him, that sufficiently shews, that yours is not the true sense; for they could never have understood it, and would doubtless have been as much puzled *then*, as all the Word *now* is to have apprehended that the Body of Christ was contained under the species of Bread and Wine, invisible & undiscoverable, after the manner of a Spirit; to conceive of a body without bigness, long without length, broad without breadth; broken whilst it remains whole (all which you profess to believe) This is to turn Christs plain speech into a bundle of Riddles; and to call this the plain sense of the words which is

(as

(as you see) a heap of Figures, is a greater Figure than all the rest; but they did well enough understand the words in our sense, because they were well read in Scripture, wherein, as you grant, the sense of the word is usual.

Pop *If we grant it is used so in other cases, yet not in Sacramental Texts, for there Christ would speak properly.*

Pro. Yes, It is usual even in the Sacraments; Is not Circumcision called the Covenant? *This is my Covenant*; Gen 17. 10, tho properly it was not the Covenant, but the Seal of it, *Rom.* 4.11. Is not the Lamb called the Lords Passover? Exod. 12. tho all men knew it was not the Lamb nor the Ceremony of eating it, which was or could be properly the Lords passing over the Houses of the *Israelites*; thus 1 *Cor.* 10. The Rock (that followed the *Israelites*) is Christ, though it was so only Figuratively and Sacramentally. Moreover, I am told, that divers of your own brethren acknowledg figures here. *Taperus* saith, It is not convenient to admit of Tropes here, provided they be such as do not exclude the true presence of Christs Body (*a*): and that the Bishop of *Eureux* owns three Figures in the words of this Sacrament (*b*); and that *Suarez* (*c*), *Bellarmine* (*d*), and divers others confess as much.

Pop. *Is it true, they do say so.*

Pro. Besides, you cannot think strange, if

(a) *Artic. Lovan.* 3. (b) *Repet.* c. 3. (c) *In Tom.* 3. *dis.* 60. *sect.* 2. (d) *De Eucharistia*, l. 1. c. 11.

there

there be Figures in the first part, 'This is my 'Body, since it is most apparent there are Figures in the last part, 'This is the new Testament 'in my Blood. Here are not one, but divers Figures in it. The *Cup* you grant is taken for the Liquor in it, there is one Figure: the Wine in the Cup is taken for the Blood, which was not in the Cup; that is a strange Figure indeed (Logicians call it *Non-sence*). This Cup, or Wine, or Blood (if you please) is the New Testament or Covenant; whereas it was only the Seal of the New Testament, as is most manifest, because it is called, *The Blood of the New Testament, and the new Testament in my Blood.* Besides other strange Figures, which I shall have occasion to speak to by and by, Here is Figure upon Figure, and yet you have the impudence to reproach us for putting in but one Figure, which you confess to be very frequent. Wonder, O Heavens, and judg O Earth, whether these men do not strain at Gnats, and swallow Camels! And nothing doth more confirm the truth in this point, than to consider into what absurdities this Doctrine hath forced you, even to say, that *the blood of Christ is properly the Covenant or Testament* *. And that there are *two sorts of Christs Blood, the one in the Cup, the other shed on the Cross* (a), *And that the Blood of Christ is shed in the Sacrament*, and yet never stirreth out of the veins: Did ever God or man speak of such blood-shed? therefore for shame never

---

* *Bel. de Euch.* l. 1. c. 11. (a) *De Euch.* l. 1 c. 11. *Ad quartem dico.*

charge

charge us with underſtanding this Text figuratively. But again, let me ask you, Will you affirm that theſe words, *This is my Body*, are to be taken properly? Doth your Church underſtand them ſo?

Pop. *Yes ſurely, or elſe we do ill to reproach you for taking them improperly.*

Pro. The words are not true in a proper ſenſe, nor indeed do you underſtand them ſo.

Pop. *Make that good, and I muſt give up this cauſe for ever.*

Pro. Firſt, for the word *This*, it is moſt evident that it is meant of Bread: It is impoſſible for words to expreſs any thing more plainly, than that by *This*, is meant the Bread. It is ſaid expreſly, that *Chriſt took Bread and brake it, and gave it, and ſaid, Take, Eat, THIS is my Body.* Where *This* neceſſarily relates to that which Chriſt took, and brake, and gave. After Chriſt came the Apoſtles, and particularly St. *Paul*, and he expounds the mind of Chriſt (and I hope you do not think he was ſo bad an expoſitor, that his Comment was harder than the Text) and he tells us thrice in a breath that it is bread, 1 Cor. 11. 26. *As oft as you eat this Bread*, and *whoſoever ſhall eat this Bread*, and *ſo let him eat of that Bread.* And again, 1 *Cor.* 10. 16. *The bread which we break is it not the Communion of the Body of Chriſt?* And the participation of the Sacrament is called, *breaking of bread*, Act. 2 46. and 20. 7. which your Authors underſtand of the Sacrament: and beſides *This*, whatever it is, is broken, as it follows; but you dare not ſay, Chriſts Body is broken. Now

then,

then, ſince it is moſt evident, that this is meant of the bread, I hope you will not ſay, this is properly Chriſts body.

Pop. *No. We are not ſo abſurd to ſay, this Bread is Chriſts body, for that is falſe, and againſt common ſenſe, as* Bellarmine *well ſaith* (a).

Pro. What then do you mean by the word *This?*

Pop. *By* This, *I underſtand neither the Bread nor Chriſts Body, but in general, this ſubſtance which is contained under this ſpecies.* (b)

Pro What do you mean by that? I pray you tell me, Do you believe that there are any more ſubſtances under theſe ſpecies, beſides the Bread firſt, and afterwards the Body of Chriſt? Do not you profeſs, that as ſoon as ever it ceaſeth to be Bread, it becomes the Body of Chriſt?

Pop. *We do ſo.*

Pro Then ſurely if it be a ſubſtance, according to you, it muſt be either Bread, or the *Body* of Chriſt; but you allow it to be neither, and therefore it is no ſubſtance at all. In the next place, for the word *is*, I have ſhewed, you do not underſtand that properly neither; but for the word *Body* alſo, do you underſtand that properly?

Pop. *Yes without doubt.*

Pro. I am told that your Church profeſſeth to believe that Chriſts body is there after the manner of a Spirit, taking up no room; that heads, hands, feet, are altogether in the leaſt

(a) *De Euchariſt. l.* 3. *c.*19. (b) *Bellar. de Euchariſt. l.* 3. *c.* 12.

crumb

crumb of the Hoſt. Is this true?

Pop. *Yes, we all agree in that.*

Pro. Then ſure I am, the word *Body* is moſt improperly taken: A learned man well obſerves, that *you plead for the propriety of words, and deſtroy the propriety of things* *. How can you ſay that it is properly a Body; which wants the eſſential property of a body; which is, to have quantity, and take up room? Take away this, and the body may be properly a Spirit; for it is that only which differenceth it from a Spirit; So now I ſee you neither do, nor can underſtand theſe words properly; and upon the whole matter, that this Doctrine is falſe, and your Proofs moſt weak and frivolous. You ſhall ſee that I have better arguments againſt your Doctrine than you have for it.

Pop. *I pray you let me hear them, but be brief in them.*

Pro. I have only three Arguments; your Doctrine is againſt Senſe, againſt Reaſon, and againſt Scripture.

Pop. *Let me ſee how you will make theſe things good.*

Pro. For the firſt I ask you, if I am as ſure that your Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation is falſe, as you are ſure that the Chriſtian Religion is true; will you deſire more evidence?

Pop. *If I ſhould, I were an unreaſonable perſon.*

Pro. And have you any greater aſſurance now of the truth of the Chriſtian Religion, than

---

* *De la miſſa.*

you

you could have had, if you had lived in Christs days?

Pop. *That were impudence to affirm: but what do you mean?*

Pro. If you had lived *then*, what greater evidence could you have had of it, then what your senses afforded; for since the great Argument for Christianity (as all agree) was the words that Christ spake, and the works Christ did; how could you be sure that he did so speak, or so work, if you may not credit the reports of your eyes and ears? This was St. *Lukes* great evidence of the Truth of what he writes, that *it was delivered to him by eye-witnesses*, St. *Luke* 1. 1, 2. and St. *Joh's*, *What we have seen with our eyes, and our hands have handled of the word of Life*; 1 Joh. 1. And St. *Paul* for Christs Resurrection, that *he was seen of* Cephas, *then of the twelve, then of the* 500, 1 Cor. 15. 5, 6. Even *Thomas* his Infidelity yielded to this argument, that if *he did thrust his hand into Christs side, he would believe*, John 20. 25. Christ judged this a convincing argument, when the Apostles thought he had been a Spirit, *Handle me and see, for a Spirit hath no flesh and bones* as you see me have, *Luk* 24. 39. Are these things true?

Pop. *I cannot deny it, they are not yours, but Scripture assertions.*

Pro. And do not all my senses tell me that this is Bread?

Pop. *I must grant that*; *but your sense is deceived.*

Pro. Then your senses also might have been deceived about the words and works of Christ,

and

and ſo the greateſt evidence of Chriſtian Religion is loſt: but for my part, it makes me abhor your Religion; that ſo you may but ſeem to defend your own Opinions, you care not if you ſhake the pillars of Chriſtianity. My ſecond Argument is, That your Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation is againſt reaſon. Tell me, I pray you, do you think any of the Articles of Chriſtian Religion are contrary to reaſon?

Pop. *No, they may be above reaſon, but God forbid I ſhould be ſo injurious to Chriſtianity, to ſay any of them are againſt reaſon.*

Prot. But your Doctrine is as much againſt reaſon as ſenſe, for it makes you believe things abſolutely impoſſible, and groſs contradictions.

Pop. *You may imagine many things impoſſible that really are not ſo: but if you can prove any reall impoſſibilities which this Doctrine forceth us to believe, I muſt yield, for we joyn with you in condemning the* Lutheran *Opinion that Chriſts Body is every where, becauſe it is an impoſſibility: and we therefore expound thoſe words,* I am the Vine, I am a Door, *&c. figuratively, becauſe it is impoſſible for him who is a man, to be a Vine, or a Door* *.

Prot. And it is no leſs impoſſible for the Bread to be Chriſts Body: Why might not the Vine (as well as the Wine) be by Tranſubſtantiation converted into Chriſts ſubſtance? I think the Mother is as good as the Daughter; and eſpecially ſince Chriſt ſaith, *I am the true Vine*, you might as well have deviſed another

* A Popiſh Book called, *Scripture miſtaken*, p. 276.

Transubstantiation to make Christs words good. I know what work you would have made of it, if he had said, *This is my TRUE Body, or my TRUE Blood.*

But to give that over, I will shew you that there is such an heap of contradictions, as never met together in the most absurd opinion that ever was in the world; I profess (when I set my wit at work) I cannot devise greater absurdities than you believe. Tell me; do you hold that the whole Body of Christ is present in every crumb of the Bread, and in every drop of the Wine?

Pop. *Yes doubtless, Christ is there entire and undivided.*

Prot. I suppose you believe that Christs Body is in Heaven, in such a proportion or brightness as he had upon Earth.

Pop. *No doubt of that.*

Prot. Then the same Body of Christ is bigger than it self, and longer than its self; and which is yet worse, Christ is divided from himself. I know not what can be more impossible, than to say, that all Christ is at *Rome*, and all at *London*, and all in Heaven, and yet not in the places between.

Pop. *All that is by Gods Almighty Power.*

Prot. Then I suppose, by the same Almighty Power, it is possible for any other man to be in so many places; for it matters not that Christ be invisibly in so many places, and another should be there visible; or that Christ is there in so little a bulk, and another must be in a greater.

Pop. *I must needs grant that; and I affirm it is*

not

not absolutely impossible for any other man to be at several places at once by Gods power.

Prot. Then mark what monsters follow from this: suppose now *John* to be by Divine power at the same time at *Rome*, at *Paris*, and at *London*; where ever *John* is alive, I suppose he hath a power to move himself.

Pop. *That must needs be, else he were not a living creature.*

Prot. Then *John* at *Rome* may walk towards *London*, and *John* at *London* may walk towards *Rome*, and so they may meet (shall I say, *one the other?*) and you may be sure it will be a merry meeting: It were worth enquiry, how long they will be ere they come together. Then again, at *Rome* all the parts of *John* may be excessively hot, and at *London* excessively cold, and at *Paris* neither hot nor cold: This is beyond all the Romances that ever were devised. Besides *John* may be sorely wounded at *Rome*, and yet at *London* he may sleep in a whole skin; *John* may be feasting at *Rome*, and fasting at *London* in the same moment. I might be infinite in reckoning the horrid absurdities of this Doctrine, he that can believe these things, will stick at nothing.

Pop. *You talk at this rate, because you measure God by your selves; whereas he can do more than you or I can do.*

Prot. There are some things which it is no dishonour to God, to say he cannot do them, because they are either sinful (so God cannot lie) or absolutely impossible; God himself cannot make a man to be alive and dead at the same time: God cannot make the whole to be

leſs than a part of it: he cannot make three to be more than threeſcore: he cannot make a Son to beget his Father: he cannot make the ſame man to be born at two ſeveral times (as your Authors confeſs); and therefore in like manner he cannot make the ſame body to be in two ſeveral places; for this is not one jot leſs impoſſible than the other.

Pop. *Theſe indeed are great difficulties to humane reaſon, but reaſon is not to be believed againſt Scripture.*

Prot. True; but this is your hard hap; this Doctrine of yours is againſt Scripture as well as Reaſon, and indeed againſt many Articles of Religion.

And firſt, it is againſt the Scripture, in as much as it is highly diſhonourable to Chriſt, whoſe honour is the great deſign of the Scripture. What a ſoul diſhonour is it to him to ſubject him to the will of every Maſs-Preiſt, who when he pleaſeth, can command him down into the Bread? what a diſhonour is it, *that the very Body of Chriſt may be eaten by Rats or Worms, and may be caſt up by Vomit*, and the like, as your *Aquinas* affirms (*a*)? And that your Church in her *Miſſals* hath put this amongſt other directions. *That if Worms or Rats have eaten Chriſts body, they muſt be burned; and if any man vomit it up, it muſt be eaten again, or burned, or made a Relick* (*b*); and yet this is no more than your Doctrine will force you to own; for if you will beleive Chriſts words, in one

(*a*) *Sum. qu.* 80. *art.* 3. (*b*) *Can.* 39. *Gloſſ. in Can. c.* 2. *de Conſecratione.*

place

place as well as in another, he aſſures us, that *whatſoever* (without exception) *entreth into the mouth, goeth into the belly, and is caſt forth into the draught*, Mat. 15. 17.

Pop. *This is no more diſhonourable to Chriſt, than that the Flock might ſuck his blood when he was upon Earth.*

Prot. You miſtake wofully; for though in the days of his fleſh, it was no diſhonour to him (and it was neceſſary for us) that he ſuffered ſo many Indignities, and died, and was crucified; yet now, that he is riſen from the dead, *He dies no more*, Rom 6. and it is a diſhonour to him to be crucified again, and to be brought back again to thoſe reproaches which he long ſince left; and all this to no purpoſe, and without any profit to us, (as I ſhewed). Again, the Scripture approveth and uſeth this Argument, that a body cannot be in two places at once; it is the Angels argument, *He is not here, for he is riſen*, Mat. 28. 6. ſufficiently implying, that he could not be here and there too; or muſt we ſay, that the Angels argument is weak or deceitful, that yours may be ſtrong and true?

Pop. *He meant he was n t there viſibly.*

Prot. It ſeems, if a man being ſought after, ſhould hide himſelf with you in ſome corner or hole in your Room, and the purſuers ſhould ask for him, you could anſwer with good Conſcience, *He is not here*, becauſe he is inviſible. Our bleſſed Saviour every where makes theſe two oppoſite, his being in the world, and going to heaven, Joh. 13. 1. *The Hour was come that he ſhould depart out of this world unto the*

Father; It ſeems you could have taught him the art of going thither, and keeping here too. I promiſe you, I durſt not venture to buy an Eſtate of any of you, for it ſeems you could tell how to ſell it to me, and keep it to your ſelves. You may remember, once you and I made our ſelves merry with a paſſage that one uſed in a ſpeech, That ſince he could not give content, neither by *going* nor *ſtaying*, hereafter he would neither *go* nor *ſtay*. It ſeems you have as good a faculty as he had; for you know how a man may both *go from a place*, and *ſtay in it* at the ſame time. I know not what can be more plain if you did not ſhut your eyes. Chriſt ſaith expreſly, *Me you have not always*, that is, *here*, *Mat.* 26. 11. Beſides, your Doctrine deſtroys the truth of Chriſts Humane Nature. I read of Chriſt, that he *was in all points like unto us, ſin only excepted*; his Body was like ours, and therefore it is impoſſible it ſhould be in a thouſand ſeveral places at once, (as you pretend it is); this turns Chriſts Body into a Spirit; nay, indeed you make his body more ſpiritual than a Spirit; for a Spirit cannot be in ſeveral places divided from its ſelf. The ſoul of man, if it be entire both in the whole and in every part of the body, yet is not divided from its ſelf, nor from its body, nor can it be in two ſeveral bodies at the ſame time, as all confeſs; and much leſs can it be in ten thouſand bodies at once (as by your argument undoubtedly it may); whenever an Angel comes to earth, he leaves Heaven; and ſo this every way deſtroys the truth of Chriſts Humane body.

Pop.

Pop. *Much of what you ſay was true of Chriſts Body in the days of his infirmity; but when he was riſen from the Dead, then he received a Spiritual Body, as it is ſaid ours ſhall be at the Reſurrection,* 1 Cor. 15.

Prot. To this I anſwer, Firſt, that you aſcribe theſe monſtrous properties to Chriſts Body before its Reſurrection; for you ſay, The Fleſh and Blood of Chriſt were really in the Sacrament, which the Diſciples received while Chriſt lived. Secondly, Chriſts Reſurrection though it heightned the perfection, yet it did not alter the Nature and Properties of his Body, nor give it the being of a Spirit; for after he was riſen, he proves that he was no Spirit, by this Argument, *Handle me and ſee, for a Spirit hath not fleſh and bones as you ſee me have,* Luk. 24. 39. By this it appears, that your Doctrine deſtroys the Truth of Chriſts Humanity, at leaſt it deſtroys the main evidence of it (againſt thoſe who affirmed, that Chriſt had only a phantaſtical Body) namely, that he was ſeen, and felt and heard; for you ſay, Senſe is not to be believed. Again, you deſtroy the Truth of Chriſts Aſcenſion into Heaven. For Chriſt is not aſcended, if he hath not left the world; for theſe two are joyned together, *Joh.* 16. 28. *I leave the world, and go to the Father*; but if you ſay true, he hath not left the world, but is here in every Sacrament; nothing can be more plain, than that Chriſt did viſibly and locally leave this world when he went up into Heaven, *Act.* 1. 9, 10. that being once there, *the Heavens muſt receive* (or *contain*) *him, untill the time of the reſtitution of all things,* Act. 3. 21; and

that at the laſt day he ſhall come viſibly and locally from Heaven, 2 *Theſſ.* 1. 7. but that he ſhould come down a thouſand times in a day, at the command of every Maſs Prieſt, is ſuch a dream as the Scripture ſpeaks not one ſyllable of, nor can any rational man believe it. Moreover, your Doctrine deſtroyes the very eſſence of a Sacrament, which conſiſts of two parts, an outward element or ſign, and the inward grace ſignified by it; and this I am told your Doctors acknowledge. (a) I ſhall forbear mentioning further particulars, theſe are more than enough to ſhew the falſneſs of this Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation.

In the next place, pray let me hear what you have to ſay for your great Article of praying to Saints.

But firſt, I am told divers of your own Authors confeſs, it is not neceſſary to pray to Saints, but only convenient. Is it ſo?

Pop *It is true, and I muſt confeſs the Council of* Trent *do only ſay*, It is good and profitable (b).

Prot. Then ſure, I will never run the hazard of committing Idolatry for an unneceſſary work. But I am further told, that your great Scholar and Wit, *Perron*, confeſſeth, That *he found no footſteps of this praying to Saints, either in Scripture, or in the Fathers, before the four firſt Councils*, (which was ſome hundreds of years after Chriſt (c). He confeſſeth likewiſe to *Iſaac Caſaubone*, (as he told our Biſhop *Andrews*) that he himſelf never prayed to Saints but only as

(a) *Bell. de Sacramentis in genere, lib.* 1. *c.* 9. & 11. (b) *De Invocat. ſanct.* (c) *Lib.* 1. *c.* 18.

he

he went in Proceſſion, *that is*, for form ſake, *Andr. in Opuſc. Poſthuma:* and that *Salmeron* and *Cotton*, (a) and *Eccius*, ſay as much in effect, *viz.* That *there is no command for this in either Teſtament.* Is it ſo?

Pop. *It is true*; *and* Bellarmin *confeſſeth, That* the Saints began to be worſhipt, not ſo much by any Law, as by Cuſtom (b).

Prot. Methinks theſe two Conſiderations ſhould ſtartle you, that it is both unneceſſary and uncommanded. I perceive I am not like to hear Scripture-Arguments in this point.

Pop. *Some of our Authors do urge ſome Scriptures; but you tye me up to uſe but few, and thoſe the beſt Arguments; and therefore I will rather urge other conſiderations.*

1. *Humility and Diſcretion adviſeth us to this duty: for I ſuppoſe, if you have any requeſt to the King, you do not ſawcily ruſh into his preſence, but make uſe of ſome of his Courtiers.*

Prot. But tell me, I pray you, If a King not only allows, but commands all his Subjects to *call upon him in the day of trouble, to come to him freely*; and upon all occaſions, *to pour out complaints to him, not doubting but he will receive and anſwer them*; and this King were always at perfect leiſure to hear their requeſts, and the oftner they come to him, the welcomer they are; and he appoints his own Son the Maſter of the Requeſts, from time to time, to receive all the Petitions of his Subjects; and both the King and the Prince are ten thouſand times more

(a) *Inſtitut.* 1. *Book.* (b) *Beatit. ſanctorum*, l. 1. c. 8. *Sect. ult.*

compassionate than the Courtiers; would you not in this case account him a fool (and somewhat else too) that should spend his time in Petitioning this and the other inferiour Courtier to gain access to the King?

Pop. *I cannot deny that.*

Prot. Then your Church hath need to make use of that Counsel, *James* 1. 5. *If any man want wisdom, let him ask it of God*; they rather chuse to ask it of Saints, and that is the reason they go without it. Most plain it is, this is the very case; and such a King God in all points is, and infinitely better than all this; and such a Master of Requests Christ is; but for the humility you talk of, I think therein you do prudently; for I remember the worship of Angels came in under a shew of humility, *Col.* 2. 18. and the door being once opened, it was discreetly done to bring in the Worship of Saints there too; let me hear what else you can say?

Pop. *We use to pray to living Saints, why not as well to departed and glorified Saints?* St. Paul *writes to the* Thessalonians, Pray for us, *Colossians* 4. 3.

Prot. Surely Scripture makes a sufficient difference; you meet with very many Commands and Examples of Prayers, or Addresses to the living, not one to the dead. Besides, you know the living hear your Prayers, you know nothing that the dead do so; Besides, I trow you do not pray to the living in such manner as you do to the dead; you do not Religiously worship the living (and about that all our question is). Did St. *Paul* invocate the

Colossians,

Coloſſians, becauſe he deſired their prayers? Can you ſay any thing more?

Pop. *The Saints in Glory pray for us, and therefore we may pray unto them.*

Prot. Will you affirm, that I may and ought to worſhip, and pray unto all thoſe that pray for me?

Pop, *No; Then our Churches practice would condemn me; for we grant, that the Fathers in their Limbus* did, *and ſo thoſe in Purgatory* do, *pray for us, and ſo do all the living Saints upon Earth, yet we do not allow Prayers unto them.*

Prot. Then your argument is loſt, from their Interceſſion to your Invocation.

Pop. *Let me hear, if you have any better Arguments againſt this practice.*

Prot. You ſhall. 1. Since all grant that Prayer is a part of Gods Worſhip, then your praying to Saints is directly contrary to Gods command, *Deut.* 6. 13. Mat. 4. 10. *Thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God, and him only ſhalt thou ſerve.*

Pop. *We do not worſhip the Saints, as Gods with the higheſt kind of Worſhip, which is proper to God, but only with an inferiour kind of Religious Worſhip, and therefore do not tranſgreſs this command.*

Prot. The Devil himſelf did not require the higheſt Worſhip, as I ſhewed before; yet Chriſt thought that inferiour worſhip a breach of that Law. Nor did thoſe Angel-worſhippers mentioned *Col.* 2. worſhip the Angels as God, with the higheſt worſhip, for they were either Jews, or Judaizing Chriſtians, (both of which never pretend to equalize the Angels with God,

but

but judged them far inferiour to God, and worshipped them accordingly); yet nevertheless are they condemned by St. *Paul* for giving Divine honour to the Creature. Next, this praying to Saints is an high dishonour to Jesus Christ. God hath made him *the only Mediator*, 1 *Tim.* 2. 5. he hath invited all persons to come freely and boldly to him; hath promised *those that come to him, he will in no wise cast out*, Joh. 6. 37. Why do not you then go immediatly to Christ? This is a manifest questioning either of his power, or faithfulness, or goodness.

§ Vide Notes

Pop. *It is one of the slanders of your Ministers, that we dishonour Christ; we only pray to Saints to pray to Christ.*

Prot. All your Books of Devotion confutes that pretence; for you profess in your Mass-book (a) they help you by their Merits, as well as by their Prayers. *Bellarmine* affirmeth, that the *Saints in some sort are our Redeemers* (b). Is this no more than only to Pray for you? Is it no more than this, when you pray thus to the Virgin *Mary? Do thou protect us; drive away evil from us, and require good things for us.* And, *in right of a Mother, command thy Son?* Is it no more than this, when you say, *The Lord was with her*, (*i. e.* the Virgin *Mary*) *and she with the Lord in the same work of Redemption.* And when *Isa.* 63. 3. is objected, *I trod the Wine-press alone, and there was no man with me*; they answer cunningly, *True, Lord, there was no* MAN

(a) *Quorum meritis precibusque rogamus.*
(b) *De indulgentiis. l.* 1. *c.* 4.

with

with thee, but there was a WOMAN *with thee,* (c); Is it no diſhonour to Chriſt that your famous *Biel* ſaith, *That God hath given the Virgin* Mary *half of his Kingdom; and that whereas he hath Juſtice and mercy, he kept Juſtice to himſelf, and granted Mercy to the Virgin* (d)? In my opinion they ſhall do well to take in Chriſt for a ſhare in the mercy. Is it no diſhonour to Chriſt to ſay, *That Prayers which are made to, and delivered by the Saints, are better than thoſe by Chriſt,* as *Salmeron* ſaith (e)? Is it no diſhonour to Chriſt, that *Barradius* the Jeſuit asketh of Chriſt, *Why he took not his Mother up with him when he aſcended up to Heaven?* and frames this anſwer (f), *Peradventure, Lord, it was leſt thy Heavenly Courtiers ſhould be in doubt, whether to go out to meet thee their Lord, or her their Lady.* Is it no diſhonour to Chriſt, that *Carolus Scribanius* (otherwiſe *Clarus Bonarſius*) profeſſeth, *He cannot tell which to prefer, the Mothers Milk, or the Sons blood* (g). I believe neither Chriſt nor his Mother will give theſe men thanks for this another day: And all theſe paſſiges are not in obſcure Authors, that privily ſteal abroad into the world; but in eminent Perſons, and Books Licenſed by the Approbation, and according to the Order of your Church; and beſides, your Church owns them, in that ſhe doth not blot them out, nor put them into her expurgatory Indices. Moreover, I muſt pray to

(c) *In Martali, Ann.* 1493. (d) *In Canone Miſſæ, Sect.* 80. (e) *In* 1 Tim. 2. *diſ.* 8. *p.* 467. (f) *Concord. Evang. Tom.* 1. l. 6. c. 11. (g) *In Amphitheatro honoris.*

none,

none, but those in whom I must trust, *Rom.* 10. 13, 14. *How shall they call on him in whom they have not believed?* And trust is Gods Prerogative, incommunicable to any Creature, *Jer.* 17. 5. *Cursed is he that trusteth in man.* Again, I must pray to none, but to whom I may pray in faith, and without doubting; and (upon good grounds, *believing that I shall receive,*) *Mat.* 21. 22. *Jam.* 1. 5, 6. But I am not sure that the Sains do hear my prayers, or can and will grant them.

Pop. *The Saints in glory do know what we pray to them for.*

Prot. How doth that appear?

Pop. *There are several ways whereby they know these things, but I adhere to what* Bellarmin *saith, that they know this by revelation from God.*

Prot. You should not only say this, but prove it. One of your infallible Popes, *Gregory*, denies this, no Scripture informs you thus much; nay that sufficiently implies, that the Saints do not particulary know, nor mind the concerns of this world. God tells *Josiah*, 2 *Chron.* 34. 28. *Thou shalt be gathered to thy grave in peace, neither shall thine eyes see the evil I will bring upon this place.* Eccl. 9. 5. *The dead know not any thing* of the particular occurrences of this life, see *Job* 14. 21. I am sure these are ten times better arguments than what you bring for the contrary. And in a word, it is Gods incommunicable Prerogative to know the Heart, and secret Prayers, 2 *Chron.* 9. 30. *Mat.* 6. 6. So upon the whole matter, I conclude, and now by the vanity of your Arguments and Answers, do fully

fully diſcern the falſeneſs of this opinion, and the wickedneſs of the practice of calling upon Saints; let me hear whether you have any better evidences for the worſhip of Images; I hope you have; and I am ſure you need very clear and ſtrong arguments for that practice, or elſe you are guilty of that damnable ſin of Idolatry.

Pop. *We have very good arguments for that: I will uſe only two, and thoſe our ſtrongeſt arguments, as you deſire. Firſt, we have the example and command of God for it; he cauſed the Images of the Cherubims to be made, and put upon the Ark which was to be worſhipped,* Pſal. 98. *if the Ark was to be worſhipped becauſe it repreſented Gods footſtool, much more may an Image be worſhipped, as our Mr.* Biſhop *rightly argued* *.

Prot. I ſuppoſe if this be a good Argument to *us now*, it was ſo to the *Jews formerly*; for length of time doth not turn falſe arguments into true ones; tell me therefore if you had lived when the Law, *Exod.* 20. was newly given, and one had perſwaded you to worſhip Images, by your own argument what would you have anſwered?

Pop. *I would have ſaid, it doth not follow that becauſe the Ark was to be worſhipped (which God commanded them to worſhip) therefore Images were to be worſhipped, (which God forbad them to worſhip.)*

Prot. Good Sir, beſtow this anſwer (as a token from me) upon any of your Brethren that ſhall argue ſo abſurdly; beſides, it ſeems

* Againſt *Perkins* of Images.

very

very unlikely to me, that the Cherubims were ordained to be worſhipped by the People, becauſe they were never ſeen by the people. You put the Images which you worſhip in the moſt viſible and conſpicuous places.

Pop. *Yet no man could Worſhip the Ark, but he muſt Worſhip the Cherubims, for they were over the Ark.*

Prot. In that caſe the Cherubims were not at all worſhipped, unleſs you will ſay, that he that worſhips one of your Wooden Images, worſhips alſo the Spider (which peradventure is paying its devotion there, and got into the Saints mouth). Beſides, it doth not appear that the Ark it ſelf was worſhipped, for that alſo was not ſo much as ſeen by the people, therefore not like to be worſhipped. All that we read, is, That the *Iſraelites* did and ought to worſhip God toward the Ark; and ſo they are ſaid to worſhip God *toward the whole Temple, and toward Jeruſalem, and towards the Holy Mountain, and towards Heaven.* Yet I preſume you will not ſay all theſe places were to be worſhipped; and if God was to be worſhipped towards theſe places, becauſe he tells us expreſly, his ſpecial preſence was there; What is this to Images, which God baniſheth from his Houſe and preſence? And to conclude this, I pray you tell me, Is it lawful to worſhip every place where God is in a ſpecial manner preſent?

Pop. *I conceive it is.*

Prot. Then it is lawful to worſhip every religious man in the world. It is true, your great *Vaſquez* profeſſeth, that a man may worſhip a

ſtone,

ſtone, or a ſtraw, or any creature where God is, for God is there according to his eſſence. (*a*) By which Argument it ſeems Chriſt might have worſhipped the Devil; for the eſſence of God being every where, muſt needs be in him. But what, I pray, is your other Argument?

Pop. *The honour of God requires the Worſhip of his Image, for that redounds to God; as if I honour a Prince, I will honour his Picture; and we ſhew our reverence to the King in being uncovered in his Preſence-chamber, though the King be not there.*

Prot. Tell me, I pray you, If a King forbid any Picture of himſelf to be made or ſet up; if any over-officious Subject ſhould, notwithſtanding this, ſet up the Kings Picture, pretending to do it in reſpect to the King, would the King eſteem himſelf honoured or diſhonoured by it?

Pop. *In that caſe certainly the King is diſhonoured when his commands are broken, and his Authority deſpiſed.*

Prot. You ſay right. And ſo God will give you little thanks for breaking his Commands, upon pretence of his ſervice. If a King require ſuch reverence to be given to his Preſence-Chamber, it is fit that he ſhould be obeyed, (ſeeing it is only a civil and not a religious reſpect;) and if God forbid any ſuch reverence, any Religious worſhip ſhould be given to any graven Images, good reaſon his prohibition too ſhould be obeyed. Your talk of honouring

(*a*) *De adoratione, l.* 3. *diſ.* 3. *cap.* 2. *pag.* 455. & 458.

God,

God, but for the way or means of honouring God, whether it be moſt reaſonable to take an eſtimate from the Rules and Practices of all former Idolaters (who have all juſtified their Idolatry from this pretence of honouring God) or from the Commands of Gods Word, and the practices of the godly *Jews* before Chriſt, and godly Chriſtians, and Fathers, for ſome hundreds of years after Chriſt (who are all known to deteſt all manner of Worſhip of Images), (*a*) I leave to any Indifferent perſon to judge: beſides, if you will needs teſtifie your reſpect to God, by honouring his Images, what a madneſs is it to confine this honour to dead Images of wood or ſtone, and to deny it to his Saints upon earth, who are his living, and far more noble and expreſs Images?

Pop. *Since you ſcorn my Arguments, for the Worſhip of Images, let me hear your Arguments againſt it.*

Prot. My firſt Argument is this, The holy Scripture condemns it as Idolatry.

Pop. *We have Images in our Churches only as remembrancers (to put us in mind of worthy and excellent perſons) but not as objects of Worſhip.*

Prot. No, friend, it is not that time of day; you cannot now deceive us with ſuch fooliſh excuſes; for your Councils of *Nice* and *Trent* do both command the Worſhipping of Images, and all your Authors plead for this.

Pop. *Well, but this I am ſure is true, we do not worſhip the Images, but only God by them, and in them; we worſhip them only as repreſentations of*

(*a*) See *Dallæus de Imaginibus.*

God

God or Chriſt, &c. *and the honour paſſeth from them to God.*

Prot. That cannot acquit you neither, before God nor man. *Micah* and his Mother were guilty of Idolatry, yet the Silver was *dedicated to the Lord* (Jehovah) *to make a graven Image*, Judg. 17. 3. alſo *Judg.* 18. 5, 6. And the *Iſraelites* are charged with Idolatry in the worſhipping of the Golden Calf, *Act.* 7. 41. 1 *Cor.* 10. 7. And yet they could not be ſo brutiſh, as to think that Golden Calf, which *they brought* out of *Egypt* in their *Ear-rings*, was that God which *brought them* out of *Egypt* with ſtrong hand.

Pop. *But they ſaid*, Theſe be thy Gods, O Iſrael, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt.

Prot. You uſe alſo to call an Image by the name of him whom it repreſents; you commonly ſay, this is *the bleſſed Virgin*, or St. *Matthew*, &c. when you mean, 'tis only their Image; and ſo it cannot be ſtrange to you that they expreſs themſelves in the ſame manner. Beſides, *Aaron* himſelf proclaims the feaſt of the Calf in theſe words, *To morrow is a feaſt to Jehovah:* The Heathens alſo excuſed their Idolatry by this very pretence. So *Celſus* (a) and others ſaid (as the ancient Fathers tell us) *We do not worſhip the Images of Gold or Braſs*, &c. *as believing them to be gods; but we worſhip the gods in them, and by them.*

Pop. *They worſhipped wicked men, but we wor-*

(a) *Lib.* 7. *contra Celſum. Arnobius lib.* 6. *Lactant. l.* 2. *c.* 2. *Euſebius de parationt Evangelicâ, lib.* 3. *& lib.* 4. *in Præfat.*

ſhip

ſhip only Holy Men, and the Friends of God, as ſuch, and becauſe they are ſuch, and their Images; and therefore are not guilty of Idolatry.

Prot. Then St. *Peter*, Act. 10, and the Angel, *Rev.* 22. and St. *Paul*, Act. 14. might have received that adorarion (as being the friends of God) which they ſo utterly rejected. *Moſes* was the friend of God, yet God hid away his body, leſt the *Iſraelites* ſhould worſhip him. And I have heard that the Fathers charged the *Collidrians* with Idolatry, for Worſhipping of the Virgin *Mary* (*c*); and the *Arrians* for worſhipping Chriſt, whom they believed to be but a Creature (though all agree they were the friends of God). I ſuppoſe if any man ſhould attempt to give the honour proper to the King, to his Brother, or Friend, this would not excuſe them from Treaſon; nor will it excuſe any Adultereſs that ſhe lay with her Huſbands deareſt Friend or Relation. Again, it matters not much to this point, for what reaſon you worſhip Images; the only queſtion is, whether you do worſhip Images? for the very doing of that (whatſoever pretences it may have) is Idolatry. Beſides, if you worſhipped God alone, and not the Image, your excuſe would have ſome colour; but it is moſt evident, that you worſhip not only God, but the Image too. I am told that your own *Azorius* affirms, that *it is the conſtant opinion of your Divines, that the Image is to be honoured and worſhipped with the ſame honour and worſhip which is given*

(c) *Epiphanius Hereſ.* 97. *per totum.*

to

to him whoſe Image it is (*a*). And that *Cajetan* (*b*) and *Gregory de Valentia* (*c*), and *Coſterus* (*d*) affirms as much. And that your *Bellarmine* expreſly diſputes for this, that *Images are not only to be worſhipped as they are exemplars; but alſo properly and by themſelves, ſo as the worſhip may be terminated in them* (*e*). Are theſe things true?

Pop. *I cannot deny but they are.*

Prot. Then I ſee the vanity of your pretences, and that you only ſeek to raiſe a miſt before the eyes of ignorant people, for in truth you worſhip the Image it ſelf, though happily not for its ſelf: as if a Heathen Emperor commanded his Subjects Religiouſly to Worſhip ſuch a Vicegerent of his; no man, who did worſhip the Vicegerent, could deny that he worſhipped him, though he did it only for the Emperors ſake. Tell me, I pray you, do you not hold, that there are two kinds of Religious Worſhip; namely, abſolute, (which you give to God or the Saints) and relative, which you give to their Images?

Pop. *I muſt own it.*

Prot Then it is horrible Impudence to ſay, You do not give Worſhip to the Images, ſince you give one of theſe two kinds unto them, and unto them only: beſides, if all you ſay were true, this would not acquit you from Idolatry; for your Church profeſſeth and commandeth the Worſhip of the Images of Saints, as well as of God and Chriſt: and ſince it is

(*a*) *Lib.* 9. *Inſtit. mor. c.* 6 *art.* 3. (*b*) *In Thom. part.* 3. *qu.* 25. *art.* 3. (*c*) *Tom.* 3. *Diſp.* 6. *qu.* 11. *punct.* 6. (*d*) *Enchirid. p.* 438. (*e*) *De Imag. l.* 2. *c.* 21. *prop.* 1.

Idо-

Idolatry to give Divine Honour to any creature (as I before proved) you are no leſs guilty in giving it to the Saints themſelves, than to their Images, and ſo you are double-dy'd Idolaters.

My ſecond Argument is taken from the ſecond Commandment, *Thou ſhalt not make any graven Image.*

But firſt, I pray you tell me true, Hath your Church left out this ſecond Commandment in divers of her Breviaries and Offices of Prayer? or do our Miniſters ſlander them? I hear, that in *The Hours of our Lady*, Printed at *Paris*, *An.* 1611. the Commandments of the firſt Table are ſet down in theſe words, and no other.

1. Commandment.

† *I am the Lord thy God, thou ſhalt not have nor worſhip any other God but me.*

2. Commandment.

Thou ſhalt not take the Name of the Lord thy God in vain.

3. Commandment.

Remember to keep holy the Sabbath-day, and Feaſts.

Vide Notes at the end of the Book.

And that the Council of *Ausburgh*, *Anno* 1548. delivering the Commandments in *Dutch* for the People, leave out the mention of Images; and that their cheat might not be diſcovered, that the people might have their full number, they make uſe of the miſtake of one of the Fathers, and divide the laſt Command into two, againſt Senſe and Reaſon, and the practice of the whole ancient Church. Are theſe things ſo?

Pop. *It is true, it is left out in ſome of our Books, but*

but we leave it in, in all Bibles, and divers of our Catechiſms.

Prot. Very well, I ſee you had wit in your anger; I commend your diſcretion, that you did not your work ſo groſly, that all the world ſhould cry ſhame of you; But that you blotted it out in any, is an evidence of your guilt. But what ſay you to this Argument?

Pop. *Then my firſt anſwer is, That this Command was peculiar to the Jews, who were moſt prone to Idolatry* *.

Prot. This is not true. It ſufficiently appears that the Gentiles were under the obligation of this Law, from thoſe puniſhments which God inflicted upon them, for their tranſgreſſion or breach of it by Idolatry, *Rom.* 1. *But where there is no Law, there is no tranſgreſſion.* Beſides, Chriſt tells us, *He came not to deſtroy the Law* (the Moral Law) *but to fulfill it*, Mat. 5. 17. Be-like you are not of his mind: And dare you ſay the Jews, as ſoon as they believed in Chriſt, were diſcharged of this command, and allowed to worſhip the Images which that command forbad.

Pop. *I will not ſay ſo; but I have a ſecond Anſwer, The thing prohibited here, is not* Images, *(which are repreſentations of real things) as you falſly render it; but* Idols, *which are the Images of falſe gods, which are not, and never were in the world.*

Prot. The Text its ſelf is full againſt you; for the Images there prohibited, are not ſaid to be the Images of the falſe gods of the Hea-

* Vaſquez, *de adoratione.*

thens,

thens (whereof many never had any being) but the Images *of any thing in Heaven or Earth*, &c. Moreover, divers of the Heathen gods were men who they deified. I hope their Pictures were Pictures of real things, yet theſe are Idols.

Pop. *Though they really were Men, yet their pictures were made to repreſent them as gods, and ſuch as they were not really, and therefore were Idols.*

Prot. The learned Heathens knew (as well as you and I do) that *Jupiter*, and *Mars*, and *Mercury*, and the reſt, were meer Men, (and they ſmiled at the ignorance of their Vulgar, that thought otherwiſe) only they thought of them juſt as you do of the Saints, that the great God had put ſome of his honour upon them, and therefore they might worſhip them; you cannot be ſo ſilly to think, the learned Heathens thought *Auguſtus* was a god really, when he was dead; yet their worſhip of his Image was Idolatry. And they that worſhipped the Image of *Caligula* (while he lived) were not ſo fotriſh to take him for a god (whom they knew to be a fooliſh and wicked man): yet I hope you will not excuſe them from Idolatry. But further, as the Jews did univerſally underſtand this to be a prohibition of all manner of Images; ſo all the Prophets, and Chriſt, and the Apoſtles were ſo far from reproving them (which they would have done, if it had been an Error) that they every where ſtrengthen them in this opinion, by declaiming againſt all worſhip of Images without any diſtinction. And tell me, I pray you, if any Jew had at that time

time made (for inſtance) an Image of the Sun, not looking on it as God, but as a glorious creature of God, and therefore fit to be Religiouſly worſhipped (as you think of the Saints and Angels) and had bowed down to it and worſhipped it: Do you think he had not broken this Law?

Pop. *I dare not deny but he had broken it.*

Prot. Yet this had been no *Idol*, but an Image, according to your ſenſe of it. Beſides, I find that all manner of Images are forbidden, *Lev.* 26. 1. howſoever, to me you ſeem to venture your ſalvation upon a nice point, for the *Hebrew* word is neither *Image* nor *Idol*, but *Peſil*, as a *Divine* told me; and this, I underſtand is diverſly tranſlated; ſome render it an *Image*, others an *Idol*. Now you venture your Soul upon it, that the laſt is the only true Tranſlation, which a dreadful hazard; becauſe it is otherwiſe rendred, not only by Proteſtants, but by the moſt and beſt ancient Interpreters *, even thoſe whom your Vulgar Tranſlation very oft follow in other places. Theſe render it not an *Idol*, but a *graven Image*; and the Seventy Interpreters (I am aſſured) do promiſcuouſly render the word ſometimes *an Idol*, ſometimes *a graven Image*: Nay more than this, that it may appear how deſperate your cauſe is, I am informed your own Vulgar Tranſlation (from which you are obliged not to ſwerve) doth frequently render it not *Idol*, but *a graven Image*, (*Sculptile*), particularly in *Exod.* 20. 4. *Levit.*

* *Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion: Sic Joſephus,* εἰκὼν *Philo* ἄγαλμα.

26. 1. & *Deut.* 4. 16. 25. & 5. 8. Are theſe things ſo?

Pop. *I cannot deny it, for the Authors themſelves would confute me. But one thing I have to ſay, you muſt underſtand one Scripture, ſo as to agree with another: Now I find God himſelf allows and preſcribes ſome Images, as thoſe of the Cherubims; either then he contradicts himſelf; or he doth not forbid all Images, but Idols only.*

Prot. Though I might ſay, God may make an exception to ſome of his Laws, when no man can, (as in the caſe of *Abraham's* offering up *Iſaac*, and the *Iſraelites* ſpoiling the *Egyptians* of their Jewels) yet I need no other anſwer but this; I directly deny that here is any contradiction at all. For our queſtion is not about the making of Images (whether by Gods order or Mans) but about the worſhipping of them. And albeit there were ſuch Images made, yet they were not made to be worſhipped, as I before proved; nor was there any danger the people ſhould worſhip them, becauſe they were not admitted to ſee them. But I pray you anſwer me this one queſtion, I am told that divers of your own Authors confeſs, that the *Jews* indeed were, though Chriſtians are not, forbidden the uſe of Images by this command. Is it ſo?

Pop. *Theſe indeed are the Words of our famous* Vaſquez, *after he hath mentioned divers Authors for the contrary opinion.* There are (*ſaith he*) other Authors, neither fewer, nor inferiour to them, who are of the contrary opinion, which to me always ſeemed moſt probable, to wit, that all the uſe of Images is here forbidden to the

the Jews (a), *and for this he quotes many of our approved Authors*; *and* Salmeron *ſaith no leſs* (b).

Prot. And you need ſay no more; for then all theſe Authors thought your diſtinction of *Image* and *Idol* frivolous, and that the word *Peſel* is meant of any *Images*, and not of *Idols* only, as you fooliſhly diſtinguiſh; and ſo your principal refuge is loſt, and you are convicted Idolaters, and then, if you repent not, you know where your portion will be. *Go now and brag of the ſafeneſs of your Religion.*

I ſee how little it is that you can ſay for your Worſhip of the Dead (Saints and their Images) let me hear whether you have any better Arguments for your Prayers for the Dead and Purgatory.

Pop. *I am glad you mention that, ſince all your Divines do agree, that Prayer for the Dead was the praſtice of the ancient Church and Fathers.*

Prot. If that be true, it is not ſufficient for your purpoſe, for I am fully ſatisfied that the Fathers were not infallible, and your own greateſt Doctors think ſo too *. But beſides, I am told that their Prayers for the Dead were quite of another nature than yours, and for other purpoſes, and they were grounded upon ſome private opinions of theirs, which you diſown; for they prayed not only for thoſe whom you ſuppoſe to be in Purgatory, but for thoſe who (you confeſs) many of them never did come there; they pray *for all the Saints, from the*

(a) *De adorat. l. 2. def. 4. c. 2.* (b) *In* Rom. *diſ. 29. ſect. prima.*

* See *Nullity*, c. 3.

righteous Abel *to this day*; they pray *for all their Anceſtors, Patriarchs, Prophets, and Martyrs*, as I have heard it in ſome of their Liturgies. Is it ſo?

I pray you tell me, why do you pray for the Dead?

Pop. *We pray that God would deliver them from thoſe dreadful pains of Purgatory.*

Prot. Then if there be no Purgatory, the foundation of your prayer for the Dead is gone.

Pop. *I grant it.*

Prot. Then let us diſcourſe of the moſt fundamental point, (as we have hitherto done) the reſt will fall of courſe. Therefore

Firſt, I pray you tell me your opinion concerning Purgatory.

Pop. *Our Doctrine in brief is this*; That though God freely gives to all that are truly penitent, forgiveneſs of their ſins, and freedom from eternal death; yet ſince they have much venial ſin and corruption in them, in which oft-times they die; therefore it is neceſſary that they ſhould for the expiation of thoſe ſins, and for the ſatisfaction of Gods juſtice, either do or ſuffer ſuch Penances, Faſtings, Prayers, *&c.* as are injoyned them here, or *(where thoſe are not ſufficient)* ſuffer the pains of Purgatory.

Prot. I underſtand your Doctrine; now let me hear two of your ſtrongeſt Arguments to prove it. I hear that *Bellarmine* threatens us, that *whoſoever doth not believe Purgatory, ſhall be tormented in Hell* (a). Is it true?

(a) *Bell. de Purgat. l.* 1. *c. ult.*

Pop.

Pop. *He doth ſay ſo, and I am of his mind.*

Prot. Then I hope you have very clear Arguments for it, becauſe you lay ſo great a ſtreſs upon it. But firſt, I have heard that this Doctrine of Purgatory is confeſſed by divers of your own Brethren to be but a new Doctrine. Is it ſo?

Pop. *I will not diſſemble with you, ſeveral of our Doctors have unadviſedly blurted out ſuch expreſſions as theſe; our famous* Engliſh *Martyr* Fiſher *Biſhop of* Rocheſter *confeſſeth, That* Purgatory was for a long time unknown, and either never or very ſeldom mentioned among the Ancient Fathers *(b)*; *and* Alphonſus de Caſtro *ſaith, That* many things are known to us, of which the Ancient Writers were altogether ignorant *(c)*; *and amongſt them he reckons Purgatory*, which *(ſaith he)* the Greek Writers mentioned not, and even to this day it is not believed by the Greek Church.

Prot. I ſuppoſe you do not think all theſe Ancient Fathers were damned.

Pop. *No, God forbid, for many of them were glorious Confeſſors and Martyrs.*

Prot. Then I ſee *Bellarmines* threats are not very formidable. But to let this paſs, How do you prove this Doctrine?

Pop. *From plain Scripture:* 1. *From* Mat. 12 32. Whoſoever ſpeaketh againſt the Holy Ghoſt, it ſhall not be forgiven him, neither in this, neither in the world to come. *Which clearly implies, that ſome ſins not forgiven in this world, are forgiven*

(b) *In conſut. Luther. art.* 18. (c) *Adv. hæreſes, l.* 12. *tit. Purgat. f.* 258.

in the next, and that muſt be in Purgatory.

Prot. I pray you tell me, what ſins are they which are forgiven in Purgatory?

Pop. *Not great and mortal, but ſmall and venial ſins, as we all agree.*

Prot. Is not Blaſphemy againſt the Son of Man a mortal ſin?

Pop. *Yes doubtleſs: But what of that?*

Prot. If this Text proves the pardon of any ſins, it proves the pardon of that ſin no leſs than others, becauſe the ſin againſt the Holy Ghoſt is here ſpoken of as the only ſin which is unpardonable in both Worlds: Beſides, Chriſt ſpeaks thus in oppoſition to a corrupt opinion, which I have heard, now is, and then was riſe among the *Jews*, to wit, that divers of their ſins were pardoned after this life, and that this was one of their ancient Prayers, *Let my death be the expiation of all my ſins*; for they thought the ſufferings of this life, and death the luſt of them, did free them from the puniſhments of the other life. And I have heard that it was one of their ſayings, That *every Iſraelite hath a part in the future life*: Are theſe things ſo?

Pop. *To deal freely with you, This is not only true, but it is one of our Arguments for Purgatory, that* Jaſon *the* Cyrenian *(who lived long before Chriſt's time) expreſly affirms, that* it is profitable to pray for the dead, that their ſins may be pardoned, 2 *Mac.* 12.

Prot. I think that is impertinently alledged for Purgatory; for the ſin thoſe men died in, was a mortal ſin, (as you confeſs) and therefore not pardonable in Purgatory. But I thank you

you for this; for now I am ſatisfied that it was an ancient opinion among the *Jews*, and ſo Chriſt had juſt occaſion to uſe this expreſſion to confute that vain expectation of theirs. But beſides, the meaning of this phraſe, *Shall not be forgiven*, is, that *it ſhall be puniſhed in both Worlds*; this is a frequent phraſe in Scripture. Thus *Exod.* 20. 7. *God will not hold him guiltleſs*, that is, he will ſeverely puniſh. *To accept perſons in Judgment is not good*; that is, *is very bad. The Father of a fool rejoyceth not*; that is, *grieveth much.* I hear St *Chryſoſtom* expounds it thus *, and a greater than he, St. *Mark* 3. 29. *He hath never forgiveneſs, but is in danger of eternal damnation*

Beſides all this, we all agree that there is a kind of forgiveneſs of ſin after this life, and at the day of Judgment, *Act.* 3. 19. *Repent, that your ſins may be blotted out, when the times of refreſhing ſhall come from the preſence of the Lord*; for then indeed the pardon of ſin is compleated and fully manifeſted. And it is a common phraſe in Scripture to ſpeak of a thing as done, when it is only declared and manifeſted, as the Apoſtle ſaith, thoſe words, *Pſal.* 2. *This day have I begotten thee*, were fulfilled in Chriſts Reſurrection, *Act.* 13. becauſe that declared him to be the only begotten Son of God, as St. *Paul* ſaith, *Rom.* 1. 4.

To which I might add, that by *the world to come*, Chriſt may very probably underſtand the time of the new Teſtament, which begun at Chriſts death. The *Jews* (I hear) oft uſe this

* *In Locum.*

expreſſion of the days of the *Meſſias*. Nay, the Apoſtle himſelf doth ſo, *Heb.* 2. 5. This alſo I have read, that the *Jews* did generally expect a more plentiful and glorious Remiſſion of ſins at that time, and ſo Chriſts meaning may be this, That *this Blaſphemy ſhall not be forgiven*, neither in that time nor ſtate of the Church, (in which Chriſt then was) nor in the time of the Goſpel and Kingdom of the *Meſſias*, which began at his death (as I ſaid) when, though there ſhould be many great ſins and ſinners pardoned as we ſee there were, yet this ſhould not. I hope you will not brag much of your Argument from this place, let me hear your other place.

Pop. *My ſecond Argument is from* 1 Cor. 3. 15. He ſhall be ſaved, yet ſo as by fire, *that is, the fire of Purgatory.*

Prot. It ſeems you underſtand this fire properly, which is ſomething ſtrange, when the whole place is metaphorical, or figarative; *The Gold and Silver, Hay and Stubble*, all are metaphorical, and ſo doubtleſs is *the fire.* I hear your *Bellarmine* confeſſeth that *the fire* mentioned, *ver.* 13. *The fire ſhall try every mans work*, is not meant of Purgatory.

Pop. *He doth indeed ſay ſo.*

Prot. That is enough to overthrow this Argument; for it is moſt evident that the fire, *ver.* 13, and 15, is one and the ſame. And this fire cannot be Purgatory, 1. Becauſe it is the fire of the day of Judgment when you confeſs Purgatory ends. [d] The time of the laſt Judg-

[d] *Bell. de Purg. l. 2. c. 9. Sect. Jam. vero.*

ment

ment is called the Day, by way of eminency' *Heb.* 10. 25. 2 *Tim.* 1. 12, 18. & 4. 8. & 1 *Thes.* 5. 4. And *the day of revelation and manifestation of all things*, because then all mens works will be manifested, and *the day wherein Christ will come in flaming fire.* 2. This fire burns the works of men, only their Hay and Stubble, not their persons, as your Purgatory doth. 3. This fire tries both good and bad. All pass through it. The *Gold* and *Silver* is in this fire no less than the *Hay* and *Stubble.*

Pop. *How then, I pray you, do you understand this place?*

Prot. It is a Metaphor, or Figurative way of speaking, frequent in Scripture, and common use. The delivered *Jews* are said to be as *firebrands pluckt out of the burning*, *Amos* 4. 11. *Zach.* 3. 2. So here, *He shall be saved so as by fire*; that is, not without difficulty and loss, and possibly some momentary shame; but howsoever the fire shall burn up his work, and he shall lose that part of his reward. Now I have heard your Arguments, I hope you will hear mine.

Pop. *I am ready to do that.*

Prot. I shall urge only two.

First, Christ hath fully paid our debt, and satisfied Gods Justice for all our offences; and therefore it were injustice in God to require the payment of any part of that debt in Purgatory. Christ is a compleat Saviour; *His blood cleanseth us from all sin*, 1 Joh. 1. 7. *He is able* (and sure he is no less willing) *to save to the uttermost those that come to him*, Heb. 7. 25. God *laid all our sins upon him*, Isa. 53. And he *bare them all in his body*, 1 Pet. 2. 24. In short, either

you make Christ but an half Saviour, and Believers wash away part of their own guilt; or if Christ hath fully washed away their guilt, you make God both unmercifull and unjust, and untrue too, so dreadfully to punish innocent persons, and those too his own children (as you acknowledge) whom he declares he hath freely and fully pardoned; and to do this for sins, which you confess venial, and such as do not deserve the loss of Gods favour, and that without any necessity. This is not the act of a Father, especially so tender a Father as God is.

Pop. *Christ is a sufficient Saviour, and hath fully satisfied; but satisfaction is applied to us by the pains of Purgatory.*

Prot. If Purgatory only applied Christs satisfaction to us, then he satisfied for our *Temporal* as well as our Eternal punishments; and if he did so, surely he did it fully, or not at all. Besides, you need not trouble your heads about the application; God hath provided for us more comfortable means of application; on his part, *the Word, Sacraments, and Spirit*; on our parts, *Faith*. You may keep Purgatory for your own use, it is not fit you should be pestered with any Hereticks there. But was ever such an application of Gods grace heard of since the World began; that God should apply his Mercy, and the Grace of Christ Jesus, by such exquisite Torments? This is (as one truly saith) *As if a man should apply Physick by poyson, or apply the light of the Sun by putting out our eyes.* God deliever us from such applyers. This is as if a Prince should pretend a free pardon to a Malefactor,

factor, and apply it by putting him upon the Rack.

Pop. *Though Christ made satisfaction for the guilt of mortal sins, and eternal punishment, yet he did not for venial sins, nor temporal punishment; and therefore they must purge out those themselves in Purgatory.*

Prot. If it were true that you say, yet there is no need of Purgatory; for this purging-work may be done by temporal Afflictions in this life. The truth is, you add sin to sin, and excuse one errour with another. But what do you mean by venial sins?

Pop. *We mean such smaller sins as do not exclude a man from Gods favour, nor from Heaven.*

Prot. Then surely you have very slight thoughts of Sin, of God, and of his Law, that can so judge of such an horrid evil as sin. Scripture fully condems this Doctrine. It tells me, that *the wages of Sin* (all sin, without any difference) *is death*, even that death which is opposite to eternal life, *Rom.* 6. 23. that, *He that shall break the least of Gods commands, and teach men so,* (though peradventure he do it ignorantly, and so according to your opinion, it is a venial sin) *shall be called the least in the Kingdom of Heaven*; that is, he shall have no portion there. It tells me, *Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things written in the Book of the Law to do them*, Gal. 3. 10. And he speaks of that Curse which Christ underwent for us, and redeemed us from. It tells me, that *for every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give an account thereof in the Day of Judgment, (and by such words*, if not repented of, *they shall be con-*

condemned) Mat. 12. 36, 37. So now your foundation, and one of the Pillars of Purgatory is gone. And as for your other fancy, that Christ did not satisfie for our temporal punishments, I pray you tell me, did not Christ suffer temporal afflictions.

Pop. Yes doubtless, the whole Gospel is full of such sufferings.

Prot. Surely all that Christ suffered, he suffered for us, both in our stead, and for our good. He was cut off, *not for himself*, (but for our sins) *Dan.* 1. 25. It was for our sakes that he bare the temporal part of the Curse, to *be hanged on a Tree*; and all that pain and shame was but a temporal punishment, *Gal.* 3. 13 I read *Isa.* 53. that *Christ bore our griefs, and carried our sorraws, ver.* 4. which was not only accomplished in this, that he bare the guilt of our sins, as St *Peter* expounds it, 1 *Pet.* 3. 24. but also in this, that he delivered them from sicknesses, and temporal afflictions, as St *Matthew* expounds it, *Mat.* 8. 16, 17, and both these consist well together, since Christ removed both sin the cause, and affliction the effect of it.

Pop. If Christ had satisfied for our Temporal punishments, then Believers should be free from all pains, and loss, and death, which it is apparent they are not; and therefore notwithstanding the fulness of Christs satisfaction, they may be liable to pains in Purgatory, as well as in this life.

Prot. To this I answer three things.

First, Your inference from the pains of this life, to the torments of Purgatory, is weak and false: I may, and must believe, that God afflicts his people here, because Scripture and Expe-

Experience put it out of doubt. But that God will puniſh his people in Purgatory after this life, no Scripture affirms. You that can multiply your inſtances of the ſufferings of Believers in this life, and can tell us of *Adam*, and *David*, and *Solomon*, and many others, have not to this day been able (though often urged) to produce one inſtance of the ſufferings of any one Believer after this life (which one conſideration is ſufficient to overthrow this Argument in the Judgment of any indifferent man.

Secondly, There is not the ſame reaſon for the ſufferings of Believers here, and thoſe which you ſuppoſe in Purgatory; nor are they of the ſame nature. The preſent ſufferings of Believers are neceſſary, (*1 Pet. 1. 6. You are in heavineſs if need be,*) both for Believers themſelves to ſubdue the Fleſh, which in this life is potent, and altogether needs ſuch a curb. *By this ſhall the iniquity of Jacob be purged*, Iſa. 27. 5. and to prevent their eternal Damnation, *1 Cor.* 12. 32. as alſo for the terrour and caution of other offenders. So that, albeit Chriſt hath fully paid the debt, yet it is upon other accounts convenient that they ſhould ſmart and ſuffer here. But there is no ſuch neceſſity nor uſe of Purgatory-ſufferings, neither for Believers themſelves (ſince there is no mortification of corruption after this life, no Temptations to ſin there, no improvement of grace, no fear of eternal Damnation,) (*a*) nor for ex-

(*a*) *In Purgatorio animæ nec mereri nec peccare poſſunt*, Bel. de Purg. l. 2. cap. 2.

Animæ in Purgatorio certæ ſunt de ſua ſalute. ibid. cap. 4.

ample

ample and warning to others. For their fellow-ſufferers in Purgatory, you do not pretend they are at all edified by their ſufferings; and men here, they neither ſee nor know any thing of theſe pains, nor hath God revealed any thing concerning them; but when God makes any examples to others, he ſets them in the view of others, or at leaſt accquaints them fully therewith, as he did with Hell-torments to this end. It were a ſenſleſs thing to hang up a man in *Jamaica*, for the terrour of thoſe that live in *England*. Beſides, the ſufferings of Believers here do come from the love and faithfulneſs of God, *Heb.* 12. 6. *Whom the Lord loveth he chaſteneth.* Pſal. 119. 75. *In faithfulneſs thou haſt afflicted me.* Accordingly good men have looked upon them as choice mercies. *Pſal.* 67. 12. *Bleſſed is the man whom thou chaſteneſt.* And *Pſal.* 119. 67. *It was good for me that I was afflicted.* And the denial of afflictions is threatned as a grievious puniſhment, *Iſa.* 1 5. *Hoſ.* 4. 14, 17

But now the ſufferings of Purgatory are in all points contrary; they are purely vindictive, and the effects of meer wrath; nor do you eſteem thoſe ſufferings a mercy, and your happineſs, but freedom from them. And therefore your Argument, from the pains of this life to thoſe in Purgatory, is fooliſh and abſurd.

Thirdly, Believers ſufferings here do not at all derogate from the fulneſs of our Redemption by Chriſt, becauſe (as I have ſhewed) admitting that to be compleat, yet they are neceſſary for other purpoſes. But your Purgatory

tory-ſufferings do, by communicating at leaſt ſome part of his proper work to your ſelves. You profeſs they waſh away part of your ſins, which is Chriſts peculiar honour, *He waſhed us from our ſins in his own blood*, Rev. 1. 5. You make them a part of the Curſe of the Law, *from which* (and not only from a part of it) *Chriſt hath redeemed us, himſelf being made a curſe for us*, *Gal.* 3. 13. You make them a real ſatisfaction in part to Gods Juſtice (which is not ſatisfied by all that Chriſt did or ſuffered without them). And in a word, you make men in part their own Redeemers and Saviours. I hope by this you ſee how weakly you reaſon from preſent troubles, to Purgatory-torments; and that notwithſtanding your obiection, my firſt Argument ſtands good againſt Purgatory.

My ſecond Argument is this: That the Scripture every where ſpeaks of the State of Believers immediately after death, as happy and bleſſed; and that all the ſufferings of Believers are confined to this life; and of this we have many expreſſions and examples too in Scripture, and not one to the contrary. *The ſufferings of this preſent time* (ſaith St. *Paul*) *are not worthy to be compared with the glory, &c.* Rom. 8. 18. He knew no other ſufferings: the afflictions of Believers are *light, and but for a moment*, and they too are in *things that are ſeen*, 2 Cor. 4. 17, 18. and therfore he knew of no ſufferings in the inviſible World, unleſs happily you will ſay that St. *Paul's* Travels were in another road, into the third Heavens, and ſo he was ignorant of Purgatory. *Lazarus received his evil things in this life*, Luk. 16. 25. *But now he is comforted*; there-

therefore ſurely not in Purgatory. *If our earthly Houſe of this Tabernacle be diſſolved, we have an houſe in Heaven*, ſaith St. *Paul*, 2 *Cor.* 5. 1. *We are no longer abſent from the Lord, than preſent in the Body*, ſaith St. *Paul*, 2 *Cor.* 5. 6, 7, 8. The Prophet aſſures us, that when righteous men dye, *they enter into peace, they reſt in their beds*, Iſa. 57. 1, 2. I tell you, their beds are very hard, and the Prophets miſtake was very great, if they be frying in the flames of Purgatory. The *Beggar died*, (and it follows immediately) *he was carried by Angels into Abrahams boſom.* I cannot think theſe Angels miſtook their way: the Thief was to be with *Chriſt that day in Paradiſe*, Luke 23. 43.

Pop. *The Thief was a kind of Martyr, and ſo had that priviledge.*

Prot. His death was ſo far from being a Martyrdom, that it was a juſt puniſhment for his evil deeds, as he confeſſeth, *v.* 41. But becauſe ſome of your Martyrs (as you call them) were indeed Malefactors, therefore to ſalve their honour, you make this Malefactor a Martyr. I will give you but one place more of many, and that is, *Rev.* 14. 13. *Bleſſed are the dead that die in the Lord, from henceforth, that they may reſt from their labour.* A place ſo clear, that I am told, a famous Doctor of your own, and one of the *Sorbon*-Colledge, *Picherellus* by name, did ingenuouſly confeſs, St. *John* had in theſe few words put out the fire of Purgatory (*a*). And I am perſwaded you would have been aſhamed

(*a*) *De Miſſa.* p. 156.

to

to have kindled it again, but that by this craft you get all your living.

I think I need ſay no more to this point, let us now go to another. We have diſcourſed of Purgatory: Now if you pleaſe, let us diſcourſe of the ways whereby you pretend to free men from it, which is by Abſolutions, and Indulgences, and that which is neceſſary thereunto, to wit, Auricular Confeſſion.

Pop. *It is well you mention that, for I aſſure you it is a matter of Salvation and Damnation; our Council of* Trent *hath determined, that* it is by Divine right neceſſary: *and as attrition alone (which is a grief for ſin, ariſing only from a fear of Hell) will ſave a man where confeſſion to a Prieſt follow; ſo all the repentance in the world will never ſave him* without this confeſſion *to a Prieſt,* viz. actual *where it may be had; or* in deſire *when it cannot be actually had.*

Prot. Since you lay ſo much ſtreſs upon it, I expect ſuitable evidence for it. But firſt I pray you inform me, what your Doctrine is in this Point.

Pop. *I will give you that in the words of the Council of* Trent *as near as I can: they ſay, That* every Chriſtian is bound under pain of Damnation, to confeſs to a Prieſt all his moatal ſins, which after diligent examinataon he can poſſibly remember; yea, even his moſt ſecret ſins, his very thoughts, yea, and all the Circumſtances of them which are of any moment [a].

Prot. Now let me hear your ſtrongeſt Arguments to prove this.

[a] *Concil. Trident. ſeſſ.* 14. *de pœnitentia, cap.* 4.

Pop.

Pop. *You ſhall. Our two great Argruments are theſe; Firſt, Prieſts are by God made Judges, and intruſted with power of the Keys for the Remiſſion of Sins; but no Judges can exerciſe Judicature, unleſs they know and underſtand the cauſe; and the Prieſt muſt know all the particular ſins, and their circumſtances by the mans own confeſſion, or elſe he knows not whether to bind or looſe him, to forgive or to condemn him; This is the Argument upon which the Council of* Trent *builds their Decree* [b].

Prot. Tell me I pray you, Is it neceſſary to Salvation, to confeſs every particular mortal ſin? What if a man unvoidably forget ſome of them?

Pop. *In that caſe we confeſs they may be pardoned without it, and it may ſuffice to ſay with David,* Cleanſe thy ſervant from ſecret ſins (*).

Prot. Now your Argument is quite loſt. For it ſeems in this caſe (which may be in many hundreds of ſins, eſpecially in a perſon of bad memory), your Judg can paſs ſentence without knowing the particular Cauſe, and therefore ſuch knowledge is not neceſſary to his giving Abſolution. Moreover, Tell me, I pray you, may not a Prieſt abſolve him from his ſins, whom Chriſt hath abſolved?

Pop. *Yes doubtleſs.*

Prot. And is not every Prieſt bound to believe, that Chriſt hath abſolved every perſon that is truly penitent?

Pop. *There is no queſtion of that.*

Prot. Suppoſe a ſinner hath viſibly forſaken all his wicked ways and company, and lives a

---

[b] *Ibid.* (*) *Ibid.*

very

very holy life before he comes to the Prieſt, and the Prieſt is certainly informed of this; Is not the Prieſt bound in that caſe to believe he is truely penitent?

Pop. *I ſhould be moſt uncharitable if I ſhould deny that.*

Prot. Then he may without any more ado upon his deſire abſolve him, becauſe it appears that Chriſt hath abſolved him. It is not at all neceſſary to a Prieſt to this purpoſe to know whether a man be a greater or a leſs ſinner, ſince the grace of God is offered unto great as well as little ſinners; and therefore ſeeing this is your ſtrong Argument, and that learned Council could find no better, I ſee your cauſe is very low and bad; but I ſuppoſe you have ſome other Argument for it.

Pop. *There is ſo, and that is* Jam. 5. 16. Confeſs your faults one to another.

Prot. Is this your ſtrong Argument? here is not a word of the Prieſt, nor of Confeſſion to him, but only to our fellow-Chriſtians; this confeſſion is mutual; and it will as well prove that the Prieſt is bound to confeſs his ſins to the people, as that the people are bound to confeſs to the Prieſt; the very next words are, *Pray one for another*; what, are we bound to pray only for the Prieſt? It is one thing that ſers me againſt your Religion, to conſider what pitiful arguments you relie upon; I am aſſured your own brethren confeſs the weakneſs of this argument, as *Vaſquez* [a], and *Cajetan* [b],

[a] *In 3 Thom. qu.* 90. *Art.* 1. *Sect. Omittimus.*
[b] *In locum.*

and

and *Canus* [c], but it ſeems you have no better: The weakneſs of your arguments for it, might ſave me the labour of mine againſt it; therefore I ſhall only offer to your thoughts theſe two conſiderations.

1. Your Doctrine makes that neceſſary to ſalvation, which God hath not made neceſſary. There is no command of God or Chriſt for it, as your eminent Doctors acknowledge, and it ſufficiently appears from the vanity of your proofs for it; you confeſs it was not neceſſary in the old Teſtament, and yet there was as much need and uſe of it then as now: and Chriſt hath made the condition of his Church not more, but leſs burthenſome than it was before. Many commands and exhortations to repentance there are in Scripture, not one which either commands this Auricular confeſſion to a Prieſt, or declares the neceſſity of it; produce one place, and I yield; there are many inſtances of *John* the Baptiſt, and Chriſt and the Apoſtles, either actually giving, or in Gods Name propoſing and offering remiſſion of ſins upon the conditions preſcribed in the Goſpel [a], among which not one of them requires this Auricular confeſſion. Bring one inſtance to the point, and I yield.

Pop. *I will give you two inſtances*, Mar. 3 6. The Phariſees were baptized ——confeſſing

[c] *Relict. de Pœnit. par.* 6. * *Scotus & omnes decretorum interpretes inquit* Maldon. *in ſumma qu.* 18. *Art.* 4. *Cajet. in Joh.* 20. 22. *Bell. de pœnit. l.* 1 *c.* 4. [a] Luke. 18. 13. Mat. 9. 2. Act. 2. 38. & 3. 19. & 22. 16.

their

their ſins; and the Conjurers confeſſed their ſins, *Act.* 19. 18.

Prot. Theſe places do both ſpeak of publick Confeſſion, and in caſe of ſcandalous ſins (which we acknowledge to be a duty); but what is this to Auricular confeſſion? will you never ſpeak to the purpoſe? beſides, theſe places cannot be meant of Auricular confeſſion, for that was not then inſtituted, as your Council of *Trent* confeſſeth. Well, I ſee you can bring neither inſtance of this Confeſſion, nor precept for it, and therefore I am ſure there is no ſin in the neglect of it; for *where there is no law, there is no tranſgreſſion*, Rom. 4. 15.

2. Your Doctrin makes that inſufficent for pardon and ſalvation, which God makes ſufficient. The great God aſſureth us, *That he that confeſſeth and forſaketh his ſins, ſhall find mercy*, Prov. 28. 13.

Pop. *That makes againſt you, for you ſee there is confeſſion required.*

Prot. And no doubt it is a mans duty to make confeſſion to God, and in caſe of wrong unto men, and ſometimes to a Miniſter alſo, as in caſe of doubt or trouble of conſcience; but this is nothing to Auriculat confeſſion, nor can the Text mean that, for you grant it was not as yet inſtituted. God declares, that *if the wicked forſake his (evil) way and thoughts, and turn unto God, he ſhall have mercy*, Iſa. 65. 7. So Iſa. 1. 16, 17, 18. ſo *Act.* 16. 31. St. *Paul* in Gods name promiſeth, *Believe on the Lord Jeſus and thou ſhalt be ſaved.* Thus *Rom.* 10. 13. *Whoſoever ſhall call upon the name of the Lord ſhall be ſaved.* And who dares ſay that he that doth all theſe things ſhall not be ſaved, unleſs he confeſs

fess to a Priest, since God never spake such a word? What is it to add to Gods word, if this be not? The terms upon which Christ offered, promised Salvation, are, *Repent and believe.*

Pop. *Auricular Confession is a part of Repentance.*

Prot. When Christ preached that Doctrine, it was no part of Repentance, for you confess it was not then instituted; your Council of *Trent* determines, that it was instituted by Christ after his Resurrection *. And you will find it hard to perswade any rational man, that Repentance wanted a necessary part before Christ's Resurrection, or that it was of one kind before it, and quite another after it. But I will not waste more time about so vain a fancy: for my part, I rest upon Christs gracious promises to repenting and believing sinners: By Gods grace I will indeavour to do these things, and I doubt not but he will make good his word, whether you will or no; let God be true, and every man a lyar.

But possibly you have better Arguments for *Absolutions and Indulgences*: Produce them; but first let me hear what your Doctrine in this point is.

Pop. *I will give you this in brief, together with the rise and ground of it. We believe*, First, That there are divers Saints who not only merit for themselves, but a great deal to spare, and all their merits are put into one Treasury. Secondly, That these merits are appliable to others, so as God will pardon *Thomas*, for ex-

* *De Pœnitentiâ.*

ample,

ample, for *John*'s merit. Thirdly, That God hath put this treaſure into the Churches, that is, the Popes hands, and from him unto the hands of all Prieſts, who have a power to apply theſe merits as they ſee fit.

Prot. There is nothing ſound and ſolid in this whole diſcourſe: Firſt, I have proved that there is no Purgatory, there is your foundation of Indulgences gone; next, I hope e'e we part, to ſhew, that there is no ſuch thing as merit in good works, which is another of your foundations. Next, that *any mans merits* (except Chriſts) may be applied to another, I pray you inform me, for I have learned quite otherwiſe: I read that *every one ſhall bear his own burden*, Gal. 6. 6. *Every one ſhall receive according to what HE hath done in his body*, 2 Cor. 5. 10. The wiſe Virgins differed from you, they thought they had Oyl little enough for themſelves, and none at all to ſpare, *Mat.* 25 9. So if you are Virgins, it ſeems you are none of that ſort. If you can prove this conceit of yours, do.

Pop. *I will give you a clear place*, Col. 1. 24. *St.* Paul *ſaith*, I now rejoice in my ſufferings for you, and fill up that which is behind, or that which is lacking of the afflictions of Chriſt in my fleſh, for his Bodies ſake, which is the Church.

Prot. Firſt tell me, do you think any thing was lacking or defective in Chriſt's ſufferings?

Pop. *No, You uſe to charge us with that opinion, but falſly.*

Prot. It is well you grant thus much; but if you denied it, a cloud of plain Scriptures would

would force you to grant it us, which tells, that *by one offering Chriſt perfected for ever them that are ſanctified*, Heb. 10. 14. And that *he is able to ſave to the uttermoſt*, Heb. 7. 25. By *ſufferings of Chriſt*, then, we muſt underſtand the ſufferings of Chriſt myſtical, or Chriſt in his members, which are uſually ſo called (*a*); when Chriſt had done ſuffering in his perſon, he left it as a legacy to his members that they ſhould ſuffer with him, and for him (*b*), and St. *Paul* bore his ſhare in theſe ſufferings; and for the laſt clauſe of his *ſuffering for the Church*, this phraſe, it is true, is ambiguous, *and ſometimes indeed it ſignifies to ſatisfie Gods juſtice for another*; but in this ſence St. *Paul* rejects it with indignation, 1 *Cor.* 1. 13. *Was Paul crucified for you?* but it is not always thus taken, for St. *Paul* ſaith he ſuffered for *Chriſt*, 2 *Cor.* 12. 10. not ſurely to ſatiſfie for him: There is therefore another ſence; and that is, he ſuffered for the Churches edification and eſtabliſhment, and ſo indeed he elſewhere explains himſelf, *Phil.* 1. 12. and I am told, that your own brethren underſtand it thus (*c*), and your *Bellarmine* confeſſeth the words may be thus expounded, but only ſaith, *the words may conveniently receive this ſenſe* (d): which is as much as to ſay, if you will be courteous, you may grant him the Argument; but if you do not, he cannot prove it. But admit there be ſuch a treaſury of Merits for others as you pretended, how prove you that your Prieſts

(a) *Act.* 9. 4. 2 *Cor* 1. 7. *Heb.* 11. 27. (b) *Act.* 9. 16. *&* 11. 22. 2 *Tim.* 3. 2. (c) *Theo. Eſt. Juſtin. in locum.* (d) *De pœnit.* l. 3. c. 3.

are

are made Judges, and inveſted with ſuch a power of diſtributing thoſe Merits, and giving Abſolutions as you challenge?

Pop. *Our great Argument is,* Joh. 20. 23. Whoſoever's ſins ye remit, they are remitted; and whoſoever's ſins ye retain, they are retained. *Anſwer me this Argument, and I will yield up this cauſe.*

Prot. What Argument do you draw from theſe words?

Pop. *Hence it appears, that* Miniſters *are made Judges, and intruſted with full power and authority of binding and looſing, ſo as* Chriſt doth not looſe (*or forgive*) a ſinner by himſelf, but only by the Prieſt, *as* Bellarmin *ſaith (a). And to ſpeak properly, as our moſt learned* Vaſquez *affirmeth,* God doth not properly looſe a ſinner, but only approves of the Prieſts looſing of him (*b*).

Prot. Now in my opinion, it were good manners to make the Prieſt come after God; and not to make God depend upon the Prieſt. It ſeems then, if the Prieſt ſhould grow ſurly or envious, and deny me a pardon, Chriſt cannot help me, for he hath given the power out of his hands: So you make the Prieſt the Judge, and God only the Approver. The Lord rebuke this ſpirit of Blaſphemy. Again, nothing is more familiar in Scripture, than for Gods Miniſters to be ſaid to do that, which they do only authoritatively declare that God will do. Thus God ſaith to *Jeremy, I have ſet thee over Kingdoms, to root out, and pull down, and deſtroy;*

(a) *In* 3. *partem Thomæ. qu.* 8. *art.* 3.

that is, by declaring that God would do it. In like manner, Gods Miniſters are ſaid to bind and looſe, becauſe they have from God authority to declare a ſinner to be bound by his ſins, or looſed from them, which (if they declare truly and according to Gods word) God in Heaven doth and will make it good. As for this Text, it ſaith nothing but this, That every one whom they bind or looſe, that is, proceeding according to their rule (which is alwayes to be underſtood) ſhall be bound or looſed in Heaven; but it doth not ſay, that no man is bound or looſed, but they whom the Prieſt bindeth and looſeth.

But beſides, if all theſe things were granted, How doth this Text prove, that the Prieſt or Pope can abſolve or releaſe any Souls out of Purgatory, if there were ſuch a place? I pray you tell me, Can the Pope bind any Soul, and keep him in Purgatory?

Pop. *No, we do not pretend to that.*

Prot. Then he cannot looſe a ſoul neither out of Purgatory; for I am ſure binding and looſing are of the ſame extent. But upon ſecond thoughts, I muſt own your diſcretion; for the binding of Souls in Purgatory was an invidious and unprofitable work, and would have bound up mens hearts and purſes: It is only the looſing of them out, which opens their Purſe-ſtrings, and tends to the edification of the Church, that is the Pope and Prieſts (as they alwayes underſtand that word). In ſober ſadneſs, it is enough to make any ſerious Chriſtian abhor your Church, that your Pope ſhould not be content to uſurp a power over the whole

Viſible

Viſible world, but that he ſhould extend his Authority to the other World, even to Purgatory. In my opinion he had done more wiſely to have extended his Empire to Hell, for there are many of his Predeceſſors (ſo far as can be judged by any mans Life) whom he might have appointed his Deputies; but there is never a Pope in Purgatory; for they who can releaſe others at pleaſure, will certainly deliver themſelves: But now I ſpeak of that, I pray you tell me if it be true that I have heard, That the Pope when he dies, receives Abſolution from his Confeſſor; and that after his death the Cardinals give him Abſolution, and give order for the ſinging of abundance of Maſſes?

Pop. *It is true, I was at* Rome *when the laſt Pope died, and it was ſo then, and our Books juſtifie it.*

Prot. I am much pleaſed with your Ingenuity; ſo the Pope gives the Prieſt a power to pardon himſelf; methinks he might ſave the charges of a Confeſſor; It were enough to ſay, *I abſolve my ſelf.* But tell me, Do you ſay Maſſes for any that are in Heaven, or in Hell?

Pop. *No, we utterly diſclaim that.*

Prot. Then I perceive the Pope goes into Purgatory, I ſee your Popes are not ſelf-ſeeking men (as they are ſlandered to be) that help ſo many thouſands out of Purgatory, and leave themſelves in.

But really, this is to me a convincing Argumem, that you do not believe your ſelves, but deceive poor ſilly people againſt your Conſciences, for elſe you might be aſſured, the Pope

would never come into Purgatory; for you ſay he can keep himſelf out, and no man doubts of his will to do it. Beſides, your Doctrine uſurps upon Gods Prerogative; I had thought it was only my Father in Heaven to whom I ſhould have prayed, *Forgive us our Treſpaſſes:* Now, it ſeems, we muſt pray ſo to one of theſe Padre's upon earth. You make Subjects the Supreme Judges of all offences committed againſt their Soveraign, and your *Prieſts* ſit as Umpires between God and the ſinner, and determine what ſatisfaction God ſhall have, and what penance the ſinner ſhall undergo. Methinks they are brave Fellows; and now I ſee it was not without ground, that Father *Cotton* bragged, that he *could do any thing when he had his God in his hand,* (that was the Sacrament) *and his King upon his knees* (in Confeſſion.) I think you will bring Chriſt upon his knees too, for it ſeems you have reſolved, that he ſhall ſtand to your Prieſts Arbitration.

I might add to this, That you leave the ſouls of people in endleſs perplexities; you confeſs, that Indulgences profit not, *If a man be not in the ſtate of grace* (*a*), (which you ſay a man cannot certainly know) or *if a man have not made a true and full Confeſſion after ſufficient examination**, (and who knows when he hath done theſe things ſufficiently?) or *if the Prieſt do not intend to pardon him,* (and who knows another man's intentions?) and yet you would have me ſo deſperate, to venture my ſoul upon ſuch

(a) *Bell. de Indulg. lib.* 1. *cap.* 13. * *Concil. Trident. de Pœnitentia.*

ſandy

ſandy foundations, that your ſelves are afraid and aſhamed of. But to leave this, I perceive that this, and divers of your other Doctrines are grounded upon that of the Merit of good Works, which becauſe I judg a very pernicious and dangerous Doctrine, let me hear what you can ſay for it: but firſt, let me underſtand your Doctrine; for I have heard ſome of you cry out, that our Divines ſlandered them, and profeſs that they did not hold Merit ſtrictly, but caſt the honour of all upon Chriſt, and the grace of God; therefore I pray you inform me.

Pop. *I will be plain and candid with you, I do not like ſuch Artifices; The Council of* Trent *in plain terms affirms, That* our good works do truely Merit increaſe of grace and eternal life [a]; *and our famous* Bellarmine *diſputes, and proves, That* good works do not only Merit in reſpect of Gods gracious Covenant, but in regard of the worthineſs of the works themſelves; *and* that eternal life is not only due from Gods liberality but from his juſt Judgment [b].

Prot. I pray you tell me, Hath *Bellarmine* ſuch expreſſions as theſe, That *becauſe God would honour his Children, he would have them to get Heaven by their merits, which is more Honourable to them, than to receive it by Gods free gift?*

Pop. Bellarmine *doth ſay ſo* [c].

Prot. I ſee he was a man of a brave ſpirit, and much a Gentleman: but in my poor opinion, he ſhould have taken a little care for the ho-

[a] *Cap.* 11. *can.* 32. [b] *De Juſtificat, lib.* 5. *cap.* 16, & 17. [c] *De Juſtif. lib.* 5. *cap.* 3.

nour of God, as well as of the Saints: But I have heard of many ſtrange expreſſions aſcribed to your Authors; I hear your *Tapperus* ſaith, *Far be it from them, that righteous men ſhould expect eternal life, as a beggar doth an Alms. It is much more glorious, that they ſhould receive it as Conquerors and Triumphers, and poſſeſs it as a reward due to their labours* (d); I ſee alſo this was a man of honour. And again, That *our good works deſerve the reward from God, as from a juſt Judge, and are able to abide the ſevere judgment of God, though he weigh all circumſtances* (e). I am told that your renowned *Vaſquez* ſaith, That *Eternal life is due to the works of good men, without any Covenant, or the favour of God* (f). And your learned *Cajetan* and *Dominicus a Scoto* ſay as much, as I hear *Bellarmine* reports (g). And that *Vaſquez* again ſaith, *The merits or perſon of Chriſt, adds no worth to the works of good men* (h). This man was reſolved ſo far to tread in *Abraham*'s ſteps; as *Abraham* would not receive from the King of *Sodom*, ſo he would not receive from Chriſt, from a thread to a ſhoe-latchet, leſt it ſhould be ſaid Chriſt had made him rich. Are theſe things true?

Pop. *It is ſo.*

Prot. Then ſure I am, our Religion is the ſafeſt way; if we do err, it is in giving too much to God; but if you err, it is no leſs than the worſt kind of Sacriledge, to rob God of ſo much of his glory, and the honour of your ſalvation.

(d) *In Explic. Artic. Lovan. Tom.* 2. *Art.* 9.
(e) *Ibid. Art.* 8. (f) *In* 1 *ſecundæ Tom.* 2. *diſ.* 214.
(g) *De Juſtif. l.* 5. *c.* 17. (h) *Ubi ſupra.*

Yet

Yet, if you can prove this, I will receive it: Produce your ſtrongeſt Arguments.

Pop. *Firſt then, I prove it hence, That* Eternal Life is called a reward, *Mat.* 5. 12. And given to Labourers in the Vineyard, *Mat.* 20.

Prot. We muſt compare Scripture with Scripture; other places tell us, *It is an Inheritance*, Gal. 4. 7. Rom. 8. 17. The ſame Eſtate cannot be mine both by inheritance and purchaſe.

Pop. *Yes it may, I will prove it by an inſtance, The glory which Chriſt had, was his by inheritance (for he was heir of all things) and yet by purchaſe*, Phil. 2. 8, 9.

Prot. I thank you for this Objection, I have ſcarce had any thing from you like a ſolid Argument but this; it deſerves an Anſwer. Firſt then, this will not reach our caſe: The great hinderance of merit in our works, is, that the beſt of them are imperfect, and a debt we owe to God before-hand; but Chriſts works are of another kind, they are complete and perfect, and in part no debt; for though when Chriſt was made Man, he was a debtor to God, and bound as a Creature to fullfil the Law; yet this was a voluntary act, and no debt to God, that he would become Man, and ſo put himſelf under the Law. Beſides, the dignity of his perſon made his works proportionable unto all the glory he received; whereas *all our ſufferings are not worthy to be compared with our glory*, Rom. 8. 18 Secondly, It might be both an Inheritance and Purchaſe in Chriſt in divers reſpects, becauſe he had two natures; as he was God, or the Son of God, it was his Inheritance, and belonged to his Manhood only as united with the

Godhead; as he was Man, he might purchaſe it, by what he did and ſuffered in the fleſh: But in us there are not two natures, nor any of theſe pretences to merit. Moreover, Scripture ſpeaks of two kinds of Rewards, the one of Grace, the other of Debt; and withall affirms, That the reward which God gives to good men, is meerly of Grace (as we profeſs) and not of Debt (as you pretend), *Rom.* 4. 4.

Pop. *Poſſibly it may be of both, as* Bellarmine *ſaith* (i).

Prot. No, the Apoſtle forbids that, Rom. 11. 6. *If by grace, it is no more of works, otherwiſe grace is no more grace, but if it be of works, then it is no more grace, otherwiſe work is no more work*; and this *reward is not given to him that worketh*; *but believeth*, Rom. 4. 5. No Proteſtant could ſpeak our Doctrine more fully.

Pop. *But God gives this reward to men for working in his Vineyard*, Matth. 20.

Prot. It is true, but ſtill the reward appears to be of grace, becauſe it is alike to him that came at the laſt hour, as to them that had born the heat and burden of the day, *verſe* 12. but that Heaven is a reward of juſtice, and a due debt (as you profeſs) this Text proves not, and other Scriptures plainly contradict.

Pop. *But God is ſaid to reward men* according to their works, *that is, according to the proportion of them, and that implies merit.*

Prot. Not ſo neither; for ſince *God is pleaſed* to *reward in us his own gifts and graces, not our merits*, as St. *Bernard* ſpeaks, he may ſtill keep

(i) *Lib.* 5. *cap.* 17.

the

the proportion, and to them to whom he gives more grace here, he may give more glory hereafter; and yet there is no more merit in this additional reward, than in the reſt. Again, I may as well conclude the blind men merited their ſight, becauſe Chriſt ſaith, *Be it unto you according to your faith*, Matth. 9. 29. as you gather merit from this phraſe, *according to your works*; therefore let me hear if you have any other Argument.

Pop. *Our works are mentioned as the cauſes for which God gives eternal life*, Mat. 25. Come ye bleſſed, for I was hungry, and you fed me; *and other like places.*

Prot. St. *Paul* did not think this a good Argument; for, though he knew that it was ſaid of *Abraham*, *becauſe thou haſt done this, I will bleſs thee*, Gen. 22. 16, 17. yet he poſitively denies the merit of *Abraham*'s works, *Rom.* 4. & *Gal.* 3. And he ſaith of himſelf, *I obtained mercy, becauſe I did it ignorantly*, 1 Tim. 1. 13. yet I hope you do not think his ignorance merited mercy. The King ſaith, *I forgave thee all that debt, becauſe thou deſiredſt me*, Mat. 18. 32. Did his asking deſerve it? Beſides all this, if God did reward them for their good works, this will not prove merit; if God reward men infinitely more than their good works deſerve (as God indeed doth) and *Bellarmine* acknowledgeth ſo much*.

Pop. *But good men are ſaid to be worthy*, Rev. 3. 4.

Prot. They are ſo comparatively to other men, and alſo by Gods gracious acceptation in and through Chriſt; but otherwiſe, the holyeſt Saints of God have ever judged themſelves unworthy of the leaſt of Gods mercies (ſo far

* *Bel. Juſtif. lib.* 5. *cap.* 19.

were they from thinking they were worthy of eternal life,) *Gen.* 32. 10. *Matth.* 8. 8. And since it is Gods grace which gives them all their worth and meetneſs for Heaven, *Coloſ.* 1. 12. it is impudence to pretend to merit from God by it. If yet you will boaſt of your own worth and merit, anſwer the Apoſtles queſtion at your leiſure, 1 *Cor.* 4. 7. *For who maketh thee to differ from another? and what haſt thou that thou didſt not receive? now if thou didſt receive it, why doſt thou glory, as if thou hadſt not received it?* If you can baffle your Conſcience now, you will find it an hard queſtion to anſwer at the laſt day.

Pop. *But eternal life is given them by Gods Juſtice,* 2 Theſ. 4. 6. 1 Tim. 4. 7, 8.

Prot. This word alſo doth not prove any merit, for Gods Juſtice is oft-times taken improperly; I read, 1 *John* 1. 9. *If we confeſs our ſins, he is juſt and faithful to forgive them*; yet juſtification is not merited, as you confeſs, but is an act of meer grace, *being juſtified freely by his grace*, &c. *Rom.* 3. 24, 28. Thus 2 *Pet.* 1. 1. we are ſaid to *obtain precious faith through the righteouſneſs of God*; and yet faith is the gift of God, and you confeſs that is given without merit, (for you grant none but juſtified perſons can merit); therefore in ſuch places, Juſtice is taken either for equity, and the congruity of it with Gods nature or word, or for the faithfulneſs of God, or the like.

Pop. *Since you deſpiſe my Arguments, let me hear if you have better againſt the merit of good works.*

Prot. You ſhall, and methinks that one place, *Luk.* 17. 10. ſhould convince you, *When ye ſhall have done all theſe things which are commanded you, ſay, We are unprofitable Servants; we have done*

that

that which was our duty to do.

Pop. *Chriſt doth not affirm they are unprofitable, but only bids them ſay they are unprofitable, and teaches them to be humble* (a).

Prot. Very well; then you think Chriſt taught them to think one thing, and ſay another; that is, he taught them the art of lying, and that to God.

Pop. *I anſwer further, That without Gods grace, men are unprofitable; they only can merit that are in the ſtate of grace, as our Church holds.*

Prot. Doth not your Conſcience tell you, the Apoſtles, whom Chriſt commands to ſay thus, were in the ſtate of grace?

Pop. *Though a man cannot profit God, he may profit himſelf.*

Prot. If he cannot profit God, he cannot properly merit any thing from God; for that implies a proportion between giving and receiving.

Pop. *It is true, we are unprofitable by our ſelves in regard of Gods abſolute Soveraignty; but not unprofitable, in regard of Gods gracious Covenant.*

Prot. It is ridiculous to ſay that is merit properly which depends on Gods meer grace; and beſides, the *Phariſees* themſelves, whoſe error Chriſt there ſtrikes at, were never ſo vain or abſurd, to think they could be profitable to God in any other ſenſe than what you affirm.

Pop. *Let me hear your other Argument.*

Prot. The nature of merit ſhews the impoſſibility of it in men; It is evident that to merit, theſe amongſt other ingredients, are required;

(a) *Bell. de Juſtif. l. 5. c. 5 ſecta quart.* First,

First, That the work be not due already: Doth any man deserve an Estate for that money whereby he pays an old debt?

Secondly, That the work be our own: You do not think a Noble-man's Almoner merits by distributing his Masters Alms.

Thirdly, That it be profitable to him of whom he merits.

Fourthly, That the work be perfect; for that action which needs a pardon, certainly cannot deserve a reward.

Fifthly, That it be suitable to the reward: If I present my Prince with a horse, and he requite me with a Lordship, who but a Horse would pretend this was merited?

Pop. *I must acknowledge most of these things are true, but this doth not concern our works.*

Prot. That we will now examine: And first all the works now we can do for God, are deserved by him: It fills me with horrour, to hear men pretending to merit of that God who (as they profess) created them, and every day upholds their Souls in life, and redeemed them, and is so infinitely before-hand with them every way: Tell me. Dare you say that God doth not deserve that you should do the utmost you can for his service and glory?

Pop. *I will not say so.*

Prot. Then it is impudence to pretend merit from God; besides, the good works we do, are not properly our own, but Gods; *Faith is the gift of God*, Eph. 2. 8. Phil. 1. 29. So is *Repentance*; Acts 11. 18. & 5. 31. And in general, *Every good and perfect gift is from God*, Jam. 1. 17.

Pop. *The first grace is from God; but that I use it aright, that is from my self, and thereby it is that I merit.*

Prot.

Prot. St. *Paul* was not of your mind; What good work is there, but it lies either in willing or doing? yet both theſe *God works in us*, Phil. 2. 13. not only the power of believing, but the act too (and ſuffering alſo) is *the gift of God*, Phil. 1. 29. And St. *Paul's* abundant labours in the Goſpel, which certainly amounted to merit, if there were ever ſuch a thing in the World, and which, if any thing was his own act, yet he dare not take to himſelf; *I laboured, yet not I, but the grace of God which was with me*, 1 Cor. 15. 10. No leſs evident is it, that our works cannot profit God, *Pſal.* 16. 4. *Job* 22. 3. & 35. 7. As alſo our beſt works are ſo far from meriting, that they need a pardon from the infirmities accompanying them, by reaſon of which the beſt of Saints have been afraid of the ſevere Judgments of God even upon their beſt works; ſo was *Job*, (*a*) and *David* (*b*), and *Paul* (*c*). And laſtly, it is ſo evident that our Works are not proportionable to the Reward, that *Bellarmine* hath a Chapter upon this Head, to prove that *good Works are rewarded above their deſert* (*d*); and therefore it is an intolerable arrogance to affirm, That divers of the Saints have not only merit enough to purchaſe eternal Life, but a great deal to ſpare for the relief of others.

To let this point paſs, now I would willingly be informed of two things which concern us Lay-people in an eſpecial manner.

Firſt, Why you defraud us of the Cup?

Secondly, Why you order Prayer to be

(*a*) *Job* 9. 2. (*b*) *Pſal.* 130. 3. (*c*) 1 *Cor.* 4. 4. (*d*) *De Juſtificatione, l.* 1. *c.* 19.

made

made in a Language that many, nay, moſt of us do not underſtand: For the firſt, you rob us of one half of the Sacrament: *viz.* of the Cup; what can you ſay to acquit your ſelves from Sacriledge?

Pop. *Let me hear what right you have to it.*

Prot. Firſt, I remember you diſputed for Tranſubſtantiation out of *John 6.* which you ſaid, ſpoke of the Sacrament; now if you ſay true, there is a paſſage in it, ver. 53. *Except you eat the fleſh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, you have no life in you.* If this be ſpoken of the Sacrament (as you ſay it is) and the Wine really his blood, then you do no leſs than murder all your people, by robbing them of that which is neceſſary to their life.

Pop. *Not ſo, for (as I ſhall ſhew you) you have the blood in the Body (or bread).*

Prot. If it be ſo, yet my taking it in that manner, cannot be called a drinking it, unleſs you will ſay that every man that eats rawiſh meat, may be ſaid to drink the blood which he eats in it; but further, I think we have as great right to the Cup, as your Prieſts; we have Chriſts *Do this*, and you pretend no more: In ſhort, we have both the Legacy and Command of Chriſt fortified with this ſtrong reaſon, *This Cup is the New Teſtament in my blood, which is ſhed for many for the remiſſion of ſins*; whereby it ſufficiently appears, that the ſign belongs to all that have intereſt in the thing, and are capable of diſcerning the Lords Body; and this command of Chriſt is expreſs and poſitive, *Mat.* 26. *Drink ye ALL of it*; it is remarkable that he doth not ſay, Eat ye all, (though they were to do ſo) but Drink ye *all* of it, as afore, ſee-

ſeeing the Sacriledge of your Church; what can you ſay to this?

Pop. *Firſt, I ſay, here is no Command, but an Inſtitution only.*

Prot. I underſtand no ſubtilties; but if you ſay, this was no command of drinking, then it was no command of eating, to ſay, *Take, eat,* and ſo the Sacrament is not commanded; but people may receive or refuſe it as they pleaſe, and Chriſts *Do this,* is no more than *Do as you liſt*; for my part, I ſhall never know when Chriſt commands any thing, if this be not a command, for no command can run in more expreſs words.

Pop. *If this be a command, it concerns only* Prieſts, *for ſuch the Apoſtles were, and they only were preſent.*

Prot. Since it is evident, that eating and drinking belong to the ſame perſons; if the one be reſtrained to the Apoſtles, ſo is the other; and becauſe you confeſs the eating belongs to the people by vertue of this precept, [*Eat of it,*] by the ſame reaſon doth alſo the drinking reach to them alſo by vertue of that precept, [*Drink of it.*] Beſides, the Apoſtles, though they were *Miniſters,* yet in this act they were in *the peoples* ſtead, and Chriſt was the *Miniſter* or diſpenſer of the Sacrament, and they only the *Receivers* of it at this *time.*

Beſides, as they were *Miniſters,* he bad them *do this*; that is, take and diſtribute Bread and Wine to the people, as he had to them; If *Miniſters* be under any command of adminiſtring and giving the Sacrament, certainly it is here, (for no command can be more expreſs,) and

and if they are commanded to give the Bread to the people, they are commanded to give the Wine alſo, for here is no difference at all.

Add to this, that St. *Paul* hath put this out of doubt, and he expounds this of, and applies it to the people; for thus he writes to all the *Corinthians*, *Let a man examine himſelf, and ſo let him eat of that Bread, and drink of that Cup*, 1 Cor. 11. 28. in four *verſes* together, *viz.* 26, 27, 28, 29. eating and drinking are inſeparably joyned together, which you have ſo wickedly divided; If it be a Command, *Let a man examine himſelf* (which none will deny), then it is a Command (which immediately follows) *So let him eat of this Bread, and drink of this Cup.*

Pop. *It doth not appear that there is an abſolute command of drinking, but only that as oft as they do drink it, they ſhould drink it in remembrance of Chriſt.*

Prot. If this be ſo, then here is no command for the Preiſt either to conſecrate the Cup, or receive it. And further, then here is no command for his Conſecrating or receiving the Bread neither; for there is no more than a *Do this*, and that is for the Wine as well as for the Bread.

Pop. *Here is a difference, for he ſaith of the Body ſimply*; Do this in remembrance of me; *but of the Cup*, This do ye as oft as ye drink it.

Prot. If ye lay any ſtreſs upon theſe words, *As oft as ye do it*, I beſeech you make uſe of your eyes, and you ſhall read it is ſaid of the *Bread*, as well as of the *Cup*, Ver. 26. *For as oft as ye eat this Bread, and drink this Cup.* Well, I am ſorry to ſee that you dare oppoſe ſuch plain Scripture, upon ſuch pitiful pretences. But I

pray

pray you let me ask you, I have been told that your famous Council of *Conſtance*, in their Canon for the receiving the Sacrament in one kind, have theſe expreſſions; *Although Chriſt did miniſter this Sacrament under the forms of Bread and Wine,* —— *And although in the Primitive Church this Sacrament was received by the faithful under both kinds.* —— Yet they make a Canon, that it ſhall be received under one kind only. Is this ſo?

Pop. *It is true, they are the very words of the Council.*

Prot. This was a wiſe Council indeed, wiſer than Chriſt and all his Apoſtles! but I ſhould think we are on the ſafeſt ſide, having Chriſt and all the Primitive Churches for our patterns: and by this I ſee what to judg of your glorious pretences, that yours is the ancient and Apoſtolical Faith, and ours (forſooth) but a new Religion. But I pray let me hear what you have to ſay for this fact of yours in taking away the Cup? I ſee Scripture is againſt you, and the ancient Church, at leaſt ſo far, that for 1400 years together the people might drink of the Cup (if they would) as I am told your *Becanus* confeſſeth *.

Pop. *You are greatly miſtaken, we have Scripture for us, we have examples there of receiving the Sacrament in one kind,* Acts 2. 42. They continued in the Apoſtles Doctrine, and in breaking of Bread: and *Acts* 20. 17. they came together to break Bread.

Prot. It is uſual to expreſs an whole Feaſt by this one thing, *Chriſt went into the* Phariſees *houſe to eat bread,* Luk. 14. 2. I ſuppoſe you think it was not a dry Feaſt; *Joſephs* Brethren *ſate*

* *In manuali de communione ſub utraque ſpicie.*

to

to eat, Gen. 37. 25. ſo *Acts* 27. 25. *Paul* (and the reſt) *took Bread and eat it*, yet none doubts but they had drink with it. Beſides, here is as much ſaid of the *People*, as of the *Miniſters* drinking of the Cup; that is, neither is here mentioned; and if the ſilence concerning the Cup be a good Argument, it proves, that neither did partake of it: if it be not, then both might partake of it: But what have you more to ſay?

Pop. *You need not be troubled ſo much at the loſs of the Cup, ſince the blood is contained in the Bread; that is in the Body, by concomitancy.*

Prot. This is in effect to tell Chriſt, the Cup was a ſuperfluous device: Beſides, we are commanded to drink the Cup. If I ſhould dip bread in drink, and eat it, no man will ſay I drink the bread. Again, this deſtroyes the main end of the Sacrament, which is to ſhew forth Chriſts death, and the ſhedding of his blood; and this was the reaſon why Chriſt appointed the Bread and Wine apart, as the fitteſt means to bring to our memories the pouring of his Blood out of his body for us; and as God would have us to remember the thing, ſo he commanded us to uſe this ſign of drinking the Cup.

Pop. *But there are many weighty Reaſons why it is not fit you ſhould partake of the Cup.*

Prot. I dare not forſake plain Scripture for any ſubtil pretences of Humane Reaſon; but let me hear them.

Pop. 1. *In ſome Countries Wine is not to be had.* 2. *Some there are who have an antipathy againſt Wine, and cannot drink any.* 3. *There is a great danger*

danger of ſpilling the Wine, which is the blood of Chriſt.

Prot. Are theſe your weighty Reaſons? I ſee the Reaſon and Religion of *Rome* are both of a Complexion. But I pray you how came it to paſs, That Chriſt and his Apoſtles, and all the Primitive Chriſtians, for ſo many hundreds of years ſhould preſcribe and uſe the Cup, notwithſtanding thoſe Reaſons? ſurely if theſe Reaſons are ſtrong now, they were ſo One Thouſand Six hundred and Sixty Years ago: Wine was as ſcarce then *(* as now it is *)* in ſome Countries; abſtenious perſons were then as well as now; the Wine might be ſpilled then as much as now. But they feared none of theſe things; either they were all ſtupid, that did not ſee theſe things, or your Church is Audacious, that dare in effect teach Chriſt and his Apoſtles what they ſhould have done. It might peradventure be added, that in ſuch places where Wine cannot be had, or for ſome perſons who cannot drink Wine, ſome other thing proportionable to it may be allowed; but if it might not, or if in ſuch ſpecial Caſes they were confined to one kind, I am ſure it is a ridiculous Conſequence, that becauſe they muſt be content with the Bread that cannot drink of the Cup, therefore they that can, ſhall go without it; and becauſe it may be omitted where it cannot be had, therefore it ſhall be omitted where it may be enjoyed. And for the danger of ſpilling of the Wine, there is alſo danger in dropping ſome of the Bread, and ſo that ſhould be denied: By this Argument alſo, the Prieſt ſhould not meddle with the Wine, for he may ſpill it; but indeed

deed ſuch phantaſtical Reaſons as theſe deſerve no Anſwer; they make me almoſt ſick to hear them.

There is only one point more, I would be informed in, what you can pretend for it; and that is, That your publick Prayers are performed in a Language unknown to moſt of your people.

Pop. *What have you to ſay againſt it?*

Prot. What can be ſaid more plainly and fully againſt it by us, than what St. *Paul* ſaith, 1 *Cor.* 14. there I find ſome, who having the Gift of ſpeaking with divers languages, did uſe it without interpreting them in publick Aſſemblies; thoſe the Apoſtle informs, that there is a better gift, and more deſirable than that of Tongues, namely Prophecy; and he uſeth divers Reaſons, which are as ſo many undeniable Arguments againſt your *Latine* Prayers: He tells them it is their duty to manage publick Worſhip, ſo as the Church may be edified, *verſ.* 4, 5, 12. I hope you will not deny this.

Pop. *None can deny that.*

Prot. Well; then he tells us, that what is ſpoken in an unknown Language doth not edifie the Church, *verſ.* 4, 11, 12, 14. 2. Yet again, the Apoſtle commands that if any do ſpeak in an unknown Tongue, it muſt be interpreted, *verſ.* 27. you diſobey this command. 3. He argues, that publick Prayers are ſo to be made by the Miniſter, that the people may ſay, *Amen*, *v.* 16. And he alſo tells us, that no man can ſay *Amen* to that which he doth not underſtand, *v.* 15. ſo the Apoſtle ſtops all your ſtarting holes.

Pop.

Pop. *The very word* Amen *is* Hebrew.

Prot. You diſpute not only againſt me, but againſt the Apoſtle himſelf; but *Amen*, though an *Hebrew* word, is by common uſe ſufficiently known to us all, to expreſs our conſent to his Prayers, and Confidence that God will hear them. 4. Yet again, he urgues, that ſtrange Tongues are deſigned only for the Conviction of Unbelievers, not to be uſed by Believers amongſt themſelves, unleſs interpreted, *v.* 22. What can, or dare you ſay againſt ſuch clear places?

Pop. *St.* Paul *ſpeaks not of the ordinary Service of the Church, but of extraordinary Hymns and Songs.*

Prot. That is falſe; he ſpeaks of the ordinary ſervice of the Church, though at that time there was ſomething extraordinary in it; and beſides, his reaſons reach to all times and ſervices, ordinary or extraordinary; muſt we not look to the edification of the Church in the one as well as the other? Muſt not the people ſay *Amen* in one as well as the other? Let me hear therefore what you have to ſay for your ſelves.

Pop. *Preaching ought to be in a known Language, for the end of that is the peoples edification; but Prayers are made to God.*

Prot. Though they are made to God, yet they are made by the Church, who are to joyn in thoſe Prayers, and to ſignifie their Conſent, by ſaying *Amen*, which requires their underſtanding: And moreover, that Chapter ſpeaks as expreſly of *Praying*, as it doth of *Prophesying* in the Church. Surely the people went

went not to Church to ſit there like ſenſeleſs Images, but to offer up a reaſonable ſervice, and to render their *Prayers* and *Praiſes* unto God by the mouth of the Miniſter, as they did *Act.* 4. 24. *They lift up their voice with one accord.* And if we pray with you, we muſt underſtand; elſe we cannot Pray in Faith (as it is our duty to do) and we ſhall fall into their error, to ask we know not what.

Pop. *You need not concern your ſelf about that; you may rely upon the wiſdom and fidelity of the Church, who takes care that your Prayers be right.*

Prot. I confeſs there is this great encouragement for it, that your Church it ſeems is wiſer than St. *Paul*; but as a friend I adviſe you to give this Counſel of relying upon your Church to the *Indians*, or ſome remote places, for they that know her, will never truſt her. For my part, my Saviours words make me cautious, *If the blind lead the blind, both ſhall fall into the Ditch.* If I had no other Argument of your Churches Fallibility and Apoſtacy, this one point were a ſufficient evidence of them both. But what have you more to ſay?

Pop. *I will give you then a Scripture-inſtance; The Prieſts prayed in the Temple when the People waited without*, Luk. 1. 21.

Prot. What is this to the purpoſe? I do not read, that the Prieſt prayed at all, but only went in to offer Incenſe; but if he did pray, he did it alone; not with and before the people, as your Prayers are; you might as well plead thus, Thoſe Prieſts ſaid nothing at all, and therefore your Prieſts need only make a dumb ſhew, and may ſave their Latine (as well as the Engliſh) which

which may be good Counſel for many of them that have ſo little to ſpare.

But ſeriouſly, can you, or any rational man think theſe Reaſons of ſufficient weight to oppoſe againſt that great Scripture-rule of Edification, and the expreſs words and plain Arguments of St. *Paul?* God deliver me from ſuch a beſotting Religion.

Beſides what I have ſaid, I ſhall leave this with you at parting, That you do not only oppoſe Scripture, but alſo that ancient Church which you pretend to reverence, and to follow her ſteps; and your practice is contrary to the Church in all ancient times.

The *Prayers* of the *Jews* in publick, were always made in the *Hebrew* Tongue, and in that tongue God gave them thoſe Forms of Prayer and Bleſſing which were then uſed, *Numb.* 6. 10.

God gave the gift of Languages to that end, that the Apoſtles might eſtabliſh the Worſhip of God in every Nation in their own Language; And I am told, that *Origen* reports this to be the practice of the Church in his time (as well as his own Judgment,) *That every one did pray to God in his own Dialect; Greeks in Greek, and Latines in Latin*, &c. (*a*) Beſides, I am told that your own Authors, *Lyra*, *Aquinas*, and *Hard-*

(*a*) Οἱ λοιποὶ τῶν χριστιανῶν οὐδὲ τοῖς ἐν ταῖς θείαις γράφαις κειμένοις ἀνόμασι —— χρῶνται ἐν ταῖς εὐχαῖς, ἀλλ' οἱ μὲν Ἑλληνὲς Ἑλληνικοῖς, οἱ δ' Ῥωμαῖοι Ῥωμαϊκοῖς, καὶ ὅτως ἕκαστος κατὰ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ διάλεκτον εὔχεται τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ ὁ πάσης διαλέκτου κύριος τῶν ἀπὸ πάσης διαλέκτου εὐχομένων ἀκούει. Orig. *contra* Celſum, *lib.* 8.

ing,

ing, and others confeſs, this was the practice of the ancient Church, and that one of your own Councils, that of *Lateran*, in the year 1215, did make this order, that *Whereas in many places there were mixed people of Divers Languages and cuſtoms, the Biſhops ſhould take care to provide fit men, that ſhould perform divine Service amongſt them, according to the difference of Rites and Languages* (b). Moreover, that your great Cardinal *Cajetan* confeſſeth, *that Prayers ought to be in a known Tongue* (c). Are theſe things ſo?

Pop. *I cannot deny it. Their Books are extant.*

Prot. Then by this, I ſee, how far your Church is not only from Infallibility, but from common honeſty, that dare pretend they hold nothing but what hath been by conſtant Tradition conveyed to them from the Apoſtles times until this day. And by this I ſhall judg of all your other brags of Antiquity in your Doctrine. So I ſee you are obſtinate and incorrigible, and therefore I ſhall trouble my ſelf no further to talk with you.

(b) *Quoniam in pleriſque partibus intra eandem civitatem & diœceſin permixti ſunt populi diverſarum linguarum, habentes ſub una fide varios ritus & mores, diſtrictè præcipimus ut Pontifices hujuſmodi civitatem provideant viros indoneos qui ſecundum diverſitatem rituum & linguarum divina officia illis celebrent*, c. 9.

(c) *Ex hac Pauli Doctrinâ habetur quod melius ad Ædificationem Eccleſiæ eſt orationes publicas quæ audiente populo dicuntur, dici linguâ communi clericis & populos, quam dici Latinè.* Cajet. *in* 1 Cor. 14.

FINIS.

Popery contradicted the

General Index

Page

Danger of Popery 1

R. Church not Infallible 6

Charge of Novelty 21

to Schism 24

Call of ministers 27

Divisions among Protest. 31

Perpetual Visibility 33

How & when Rome fell 42

Of the Holy Scriptures

Proof of Scriptures without the Churches Testimony 4
Canonical & Apocryphal Books of Scripture 4
Sufficiency of Scripture & of Tradition — — 5
Plainness & Obscurity of Scripture — — 6

Part 2nd

Church will be judge 6
[illegible]ists vilify Scripture
[illegible] tear a trial 6
[illegible] the Scripture

Popery contradicts the
end of Religion 7
Desperate issues Papists
driven to ——— 7
Partiality of R. Religion 7
Great hazard & uncer-
tainty of Popery
Popery destroys Morality
Sacrifice of the Mass
Transubstantiation
Prayer to Saints
Image worship

...ayers for the Dead

...urgatory —— 13

...ricular Confession 14

...bolutions & Indulgences

...erits — —— 15

...nying the cup to the peop...

Prayers in an un-

known tongue 17

Finis